LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter ... Rare
No. ... March 25th 1858.

Case, Division ...
Shelf, Section ... SCC.
Book, No. ... 1330

ספר הלז שלי
וכתבתי בו שמי
יוספא בר שמואל חפשי

J. S. C. F. FREY.

64 — 3
4 8

1.50

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

WORSHIP OF THE SON AND THE HOLY GHOST

AGAINST THE

EXCEPTIONS OF MR. THEOPHILUS LINDSEY

FROM

SCRIPTURE AND ANTIQUITY,

BEING A

SUPPLEMENT TO A TREATISE

Formerly published and entitled

A VINDICATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

BY THOMAS RANDOLPH, D.D.
President of C.C.C. and LADY MARGARET'S
Professor of Divinity in the University of *Oxford*.

All Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.
Joh. v. 23.

OXFORD:

Printed for J. and J. FLETCHER, in the TURLE: And sold by J. and F. RIVINGTON, in St. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON; T. and J. MERRILL, at CAMBRIDGE, and J. SMITH, in CANTERBURY. 1775.

Imprimatur,

THO. FOTHERGILL,

Vice-Can. OXON.

14 *Feb.* 1775.

A

VINDICATION, &c.

I CAREFULLY read over Mr. *Lindsey*'s *Apology*, soon after it made it's Appearance. I was amazed to see such confident Assertions advanced with such very slender Proof. I examined into such Authorities as he had produced, and drew up some Observations upon them. I afterwards received two excellent Answers to this Work of Mr. *Lindsey*; one written by the ingenious and learned Mr. *Bingham*; the other by a *Layman*, but one *mighty in the Scriptures*, and able to give a good *Reason of the Hope that is in him*. I then threw aside my Papers, as unnecessary in Answer to Suggestions already sufficiently confuted. But having since revised them, I have thought fit to offer them to the Public, and that chiefly for these two Reasons. Some time ago I published *A Vindication of*

the Doctrine of the Trinity, in Answer to a Treatise written by the late *Bishop of Clogher*, entitled, *An Essay on Spirit*. I therein insisted chiefly on the Proofs of our *Saviour's Divinity*. I had but little Reason to say any thing of *the Worship of Christ*, as the *Bishop* had insisted on this, as strongly as I could do. And this has been the Case of most, who have wrote in Defence of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. None of their Adversaries denied *the Worship of Christ*; and therefore they thought it sufficient to prove *Christ* to be truly *God*, and from thence to leave Men to infer the Duty of *worshipping* him. They proceeded not to give the particular Proofs of this, or to answer such Objections as might be made against it. I therefore thought that a Work of this Kind might not be an improper, or useless, Appendix to my *Vindication*.

Another Reason why I thought fit to undertake this, was the great Importance of the Subject. If any thing is of Importance in Religion, it must be the *Object of Worship*. If our *Saviour* is truly *God*, we cannot without great Impiety with-hold from him the Honour, and Worship, due to him as such. If he is only a Creature, we cannot worship him without *Idolatry*. I thought therefore

that

that such a Point could not be too carefully considered, nor the Arguments set in too full a Light. And as I found some things in my Papers, which I flattered myself were of some Consequence, and which had escaped the Notice of those excellent Writers, who had appeared before me in this Controversy; I thought my Pains would not be ill bestowed in preparing them for the Press. As the Proofs of the *Divinity* of our *Saviour*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, have been largely set forth in my *Vindication*, to which this is an Appendix; and as Mr. *Lindsey*'s Objections to this Doctrine have not only been most of them therein answered, but also sufficiently confuted, by the able Writers above-mentioned, I shall confine myself chiefly to what he has offered against the *Worship of Jesus Christ*.

To begin with the *Old Testament*, our *Apologist* asserts [a], that *the Hebrews never dreamed of a Plurality in the Deity:* and [b] that *the Law of God given to the Jews by Moses invariably taught the Unity of God, and appropriated religious Worship to God only.* And so also do we, *who worship one God in Trinity,*

[a] Page 87. [b] Page 119, 120.

and Trinity in Unity. If the *Jews* were unacquainted with the Diſtinction of *Perſons* in the *Godhead,* they could *worſhip one only God* in the general. But we, who have been taught this Diſtinction, and have been *baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt,* are obliged to worſhip each *Divine Perſon* ſeparately. But have we no Proofs, or Intimations, in the *Old Teſtament,* of *a Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead?* I humbly think that we have a great many. It was aſſerted by the late *Biſhop of Clogher,* in his *Eſſay on Spirit,* and proved to be the Opinion of the ancient *Jews,* that there was a *Second Perſon, called in the Old Teſtament Jehovah,* who appeared to *Moſes,* and the *Patriarchs*; as alſo a *third Eſſence, or Being, to whom the Jews paid divine Honours,* though his Lordſhip was not willing to allow this as any Proof of their *Divinity.* It was alſo the conſtant Doctrine of the *Primitive Fathers,* that the *Son of God* was the Perſon who appeared to the *Patriarchs.* And this has been ſince aſſerted, by Biſhop *Bull,* Dr. *Waterland,* Mr. *Allix,* and many others, who have from thence inferred that he was truly, and properly *God.* But our *Apologiſt* is pleaſed to treat this Notion with great Contempt: —

Some

[c] *Some Chriſtians* (he tells us) *have pretended to gather it from the plural Termination of a Hebrew Word, Elohim, and from the Chaldee Targums.* ——But are theſe the only Arguments they make Uſe of? It is a common Artifice of our Author, when he meets with what he thinks a weak Argument in an orthodox Writer, to lay hold of that, and paſs by all the reſt. The ſame Dr. *Allix*, whom our Author here refers to [d], and who quotes *Gen.* i. 1. to prove a *Plurality of Perſons in the Divine Eſſence*, in the very next Page quotes *Gen.* i. 26. where we read that *God ſaid — Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs* — and alſo *Gen.* iii. 22. where we are told that *God ſaid --- Behold the Man is become as one of us to know Good and Evil.* See alſo *Gen.* xi. 7. Theſe Texts our *Apologiſt* wiſely paſſes by, which plainly denote a *Plurality of Perſons* [e]. I ſhall give the Argument nearly in the Words of a moſt ancient Fa-

[c] Page 87. [d] Ch. ix. p. 116.

[e] *Juſtin. Martyr.* Dial. cum *Tryph.* p. 285, See alſo p. 359.---*Calvin*, who diſallows of the Proof of a *Plurality of Perſons* from *Gen.* i. 1. yet enforces ſtrongly the Argument from this Text. And whereas ſome had pretended that *God* ſpoke here in the Plural Number, after the Manner of Kings and Princes, *Calvin* adds, that this was a Language of much later Date. See alſo *Patrick*, *Ainſworth* Comment.

ther

ther of the Church——*Moſes ſhews by theſe Words,—Let us make Man in our Image,* &c. *that this Second Perſon is called God in the ſame Senſe.---Nor can you ſay that God ſpake this to himſelf, or to the Elements, or Earth. For in another Place God ſays — Behold, the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil. Here at leaſt two Perſons are ſignified, each of them intelligent. Nor can it be ſaid* (adds our Author) *that God ſpake this to the Angels, or that Man was created by the Angels: but this Offſpring, which really proceeded from the Father, co-exiſted with the Father before all Creatures, and with him the Father here holds Diſcourſe.* --- The ſame Argument is urged by *Irenæus* [f], by *Tertullian* [g], and by *Novatian* [h].

Nor does the Argument from the Word *Elohim* merit the Contempt here thrown upon it. If indeed our Argument depended wholly on the Plural Termination of the Word, and we had no other Proof of our *Lord's Divinity* from the *Old Teſtament*, we ought not to lay great Streſs on it. But let us conſider that the *Hebrew* Language is one of the moſt ancient Languages in the world. It is thought

[f] L. iv. Præfat. C. 37. L. v. c. 15.
[g] Adv. Prax. C. 12. [h] C. 21.

by

by ſome to be the Original Language of Mankind, taught by *God* himſelf. How came it then to paſs that in this primitive Language a *Plural* Word ſhould be the moſt common Term uſed to ſignify the *Deity?* How came *Moſes*, an inſpired Writer, to chooſe out this Word, when another ſingular Noun might have been had, to deſcribe the Creation of the World by the *Supreme God.* Nay, (what is ſtill more remarkable) he uſes this Word in aſſerting the *Unity* of the Godhead ——יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד — [i] *Jehovah our Gods is One Jehovah*——This, if he did not hereby deſign to denote a *Plurality of Perſons* in the *Godhead*, ſhould ſeem to be a ſtrange Form of Expreſſion. If therefore this Word is ſometimes applied to Creatures, who bear ſome Similitude, or Relation, to *God*; or if it ſometimes denotes one particular Perſon in the *Trinity*, we may, notwithſtanding this, be allowed to conclude, with ſome Degree of Probability, that it was intended, in it's original Acceptation, to ſet forth a *Plurality of Perſons* in the *Godhead.* To this it may be added, that as we read *Gen.* i. 1. that *God--Elohim--created the Heaven, and the Earth* [k],

[i] Deut. vi. 4. [k] John i. 1, 3.

ſo

ſo we are taught by St. *John* that *the Word was God*, and that *all things were made by him*. It is eaſy to cavil at Parts of an Argument, when taken to pieces. But I would deſire the intelligent Reader to conſider all theſe things together, and judge for himſelf. We want not this Proof.

As to the *Chaldee Targums*, they are brought only as one Proof out of many, that the *Jews* had a Notion of a *Second Perſon* in the *Godhead*. In many Places where the *Hebrew* ſpeaks of *God*, theſe *Targums* render it by *Memra*, or the *Word*: and to this *Word* they aſcribe perſonal Actions. I am ſenſible indeed that ſome [l] learned and judicious Writers diſapprove of this Argument. They ſay, that the Word *Memra*, or the *Word of God*, is often uſed for the reciprocal Pronoun, and ſignifies no more than *God himſelf*. But to this it has been anſwered by [m] Dr. *Allix*, and other learned Men, that if in ſome Places the Word may have that Senſe, in many others it cannot bear ſuch a Senſe, but plainly ſignifies a Perſon diſtinct from *God the Father*. I refer

[l] *Prideaux* Connect. Part ii. B. 8. p. 431. — *Lud. Capellus* Op. p. 76. [m] *Allix* Judgment of *Jewiſh* Church, C. 12, and 24. *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 1. C. 1. n. 19. *Kidder* Demonſt. Meſſ. P. iii. c. 5. — *Grotius*, *Hammond*, *Whitby in Joh.* i. 1.

for

for Inſtances to the Authors cited in the Notes. I ſhall take Notice only of one produced by our *Apologiſt*. In *Jonathan's Targum*, cited by *Petrus Galatinus* [n], who lived at the Beginning of the ſixteenth Century, and before him by *Raymond Martini* [o], who lived in the thirteenth Century, *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord*, Pſal. cx. i. is rendered --The Lord ſaid unto his Word --- Sit thou on my Right Hand, &c.——Here the *Memra*, or *Word*, is plainly a Perſon diſtinct from *the Lord*, who ſpake to him. And this Perſon, as our [p] *Saviour* himſelf and his *Apoſtles* have taught us, was he, who was afterwards *made Fleſh, and dwelt amongſt us, Chriſt the Lord*. Many other Proofs are brought by Dr. *Allix* from other *Jewiſh* Writers of a Diſtinction of *Perſons* in the *Godhead*. And this is greatly confirmed by the Teſtimony of *Euſebius* [q], who aſſures us that the *Jews* had a Notion of a *Second Perſon* in the *Godhead, whom they called the Image, the Power, the Wiſdom, and*

[n] Arcana, L. viii. c. 23. L. iii. c. 5. [o] Pugio Fidei, p. 705. This *Targum* is cited alſo by P. *Fagius* on Deut. v. This is, I believe, not now extant. The *Targums* in *Walton's Polyglott* give quite another Senſe to the Pſalm, and interpret it wholly of *David*.

[p] Matt. xxii. 44. Acts ii. 34. Heb. i. 13.

[q] Præpar. Evan. L. vii. C. 15. See my *Vindication*, p. 17, &c.

the Word, of God; and for this he produces the Authority of *Philo the Jew.* He [r] cites a Paſſage from him, wherein he ſpeaks of a *Second God, who was the Word of the Father of the Univerſe,* and ſays, that *the eternal Word of the eternal God is the ſtrongeſt, and firmeſt, Support of the Univerſe.* [s] And as the *Targums* tell us that the *Memra,* or *Word of the Lord, created the Heaven, and the Earth,* ſo *Philo* ſays, that the *inviſible Logos,* or *Word, is the Image of God,* and that *by him God created the World.* And as they expreſs the Word *Jehovah* in the Appearances of *God* in the *Old Teſtament* by *Memra,* ſo *Philo* teaches us that it was the *Logos,* or *Word,* [t] who *appeared to Adam* in *Paradiſe,* [u] to *Abraham, &c.* [w] and that it was *his true Word, his firſt-begotten Son, who led the Children of Iſrael through the Wilderneſs.*

And St. *John* (as all the beſt Commentators agree) when he ſtiled the *Son of God*---Λογος--- or *Word,* ſpake in the Language of the *Jews* of his Time. He teaches us that--*In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word*

[r] Ib. c. 13. [s] De Mund. Opif. p. 6.
[t] De Somniis, p. 593. [u] Ib. 578. [w] De Agricult. p. 195.

was

was with God, and the Word was God [x]. But our *Apologiſt* [y] ſeems willing to infer from his Interpretation of the Word *Memra*, that the *Logos*, or *Word*, in the Text, *is wrongly applied to Chriſt, and is nothing but a Deſcription, in the Hebrew way, of God himſelf.* I wiſh he had given us his Interpretation at length. It ſhould ſeem to be, according to him---*In the Beginning was God himſelf, and God himſelf was with God, and God himſelf was God.* He ought not to wonder if *many are unwilling to admit* ſuch an *Interpretation.* And I muſt farther aſk him, how he would interpret ver. 14. where we read that *the Word was made Fleſh.* Dr. *Clarke* [z], though, both in his *Paraphraſe*, and *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, he ſeems willing to call our *Saviour* any thing but what St. *John* expreſsly calls him --- *God*--- yet [a] allows that he *was that viſible Perſon, who under the Old Teſtament appeared in the Form of God, God the Angel of the Lord*, who appeared to *Jacob*, *Gen.* xxxi. 12, 13. *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16.

This is alſo the conſtant Doctrine of [b] *Euſebius*, and all the Primitive Fathers before

[x] Joh. 1. i. [y] P. 89. [z] See my Vind. P. ii. p. 23, &c.
[a] Script. Doct. No. 535. [b] Demonſt. Evang. L. v. C. 7, 8.

him, that it was the *Son of God*, who appeared to the *Patriarchs*, and was worſhipped by them, and they from thence prove his *Divinity*. *Juſtin Martyr* tells us, that [b] it was *Chriſt* who *appeared to Moſes in the Buſh*, who ſaid —— *I am that I am, the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, the God of Jacob, the God of your Fathers:* and that *this was the Word, the Firſt-begotten of God, and himſelf God*;——that *he is the Object of Worſhip, God, and Chriſt*; and that [c] *he was the King of Glory, who ſat between the Cherubim, whom Moſes*, and *Samuel, and the Children of Iſrael worſhipped as God, and he heard them*; and whom alſo *all the Angels of God worſhipped.* To the ſame Purpoſe ſpeaks *Irenæus* [f]. He teaches us that it was *Chriſt, who with the Father is the God of the Living, who ſpake to Moſes, and was manifeſted to the Fathers, and worſhipped by the Prophets*; [g] that it was he whoſe *Glory Iſaiah ſaw*, and who appeared to *Ezekiel*; *the* [h] *God*, who was *known in Judah*, whoſe *Dwelling-place was in Sion.* [i] In another Place he tells us, that *the Scripture*

[b] Apol. ii. p. 95, 96. [c] P. 95. [d] Dial. Tryph. p. 287. [e] Ib. p. 255, 256. P. 359. [f] L. iv. C. 11. See alſo C. 15. 16. [g] L. iv. C. 37. [h] L. iii. 9. Pſal. lxxvi. 2. [i] L. iii. C. 6.

no

no where calls any one God, but what is truly God: and yet in the ſame Chapter he tells us that *the Son* is the Perſon ſpoken of by the *Pſalmiſt*, *Pſal.* l. and called *the God of Gods*, *Jehovah the God*, who *ſhined out of Zion.* I might [k] produce ſimilar Inſtances from almoſt all the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries: but this may be ſufficient. Nor was this a vain opinion taken up by theſe Fathers, but what they learnt from the *Scriptures* themſelves. As we are told in the *Old Teſtament*, that [l] *Jehovah appeared to Abraham*, and that he offered up Prayers to him, [m] ſo *Chriſt* himſelf affirms that *Abraham rejoiced to ſee his Day, and he ſaw it and was glad:* and he adds --- [n] *Before Abraham was I am.* —— Does the [o] *Old Teſtament* teach us that *Jehovah led the People of Iſrael through the Wilderneſs*, and call him *the* [p] *Rock of Iſrael?*— St. *Paul* [q] informs us, that *this Rock was*

[k] Vide *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. l. c. 1. [l] Gen. xviii. [m] Joh. viii. 56, &c.

[n] The Context obliges us to interpret this of *Chriſt*'s Preexiſtence. This is an Anſwer to the *Jews*, who aſked him, —*Art thou greater than our Father Abraham?*—and wondered how he, who *was not yet fifty Years old*, could have *ſeen Abraham.*

[o] Deut. viii. 2, 15. [p] Deut. xxxii. 15. 2 Sam. xxiii. 3. [q] 1 Cor. x. 4, 9.

Chriſt,

Chriſt, and admoniſhes us *not* to *tempt Chriſt*, *as ſome of them alſo tempted*. Do we read in the *Old Teſtament* that [r] *Jehovah dwelt between the Cherubim*, and that [s] *Iſaiah* ſaw his Glory there? St. *John* [t] aſſures us, that the *Glory*, which he *ſaw*, was the *Glory of Chriſt*. And the ſame [u] Evangeliſt teaches us, that *the Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us*——ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν — *he pitched his Tabernacle among us: and we beheld his Glory, the Glory, as of the Only-begotten of the Father.* And in Reference to this his Appearance in the Sanctuary *Chriſt* is called in the *New Teſtament*, [w] *the Glory of Iſrael*, [x] *the Lord of Glory*, [y] *the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon.* [z] And he appeared to his Apoſtles at his *Transfiguration*, [a] and afterwards in a Viſion to St. *John*; in a Glory ſimilar to the Deſcription of him who *ſat on the Throne* in the Prophecies of *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*. We are aſſured alſo that he will come to Judgment in a Glory exactly correſponding to that which

[r] 2 Sam. vi. 2. Pſal. xcix. 1. [s] Iſaiah vi. 1, &c.
[t] Joh. xii. 41. [u] Joh. i. 14. [w] Luke ii. 32.
[x] 1 Cor. ii. 8. [y] Heb. i. 3. [z] Matt. xvii. Mar. ix.
[a] Compare Rev. i. 14, &c. with Ezek. i. 26. and Dan. vii. 9. See alſo my Sermon on John xii. 41.

appeared

appeared in the Sanctuary. [b] He there manifested his Presence by a visible Appearance of *Glory* encompassed with *Clouds*. [c] He there *sat on a Throne*, attended by his *Angels*. And [d] he himself hath told us, that in the End of the World *he shall come in the Clouds of Heaven with Power and great Glory*; [e] that *he shall come in his own, and in his Father's Glory, and all the holy Angels with him, and shall sit on the Throne of his Glory*. [f] And his Apostle assures that *the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty Angels*, or rather [g] *with the Angels of his own Power*. We find therefore that the Person, who appeared to the Patriarchs, and sat *enthroned in Glory* in the Tabernable, and Temple, was *the Son of God, the Word*, who was afterwards *made Flesh, and dwelt among us*. And this Person is called [h] *Jehovah*, [i] *the Lord of Hosts*, [k] *the God of Gods*, [l] *the most high God*, [m] *the Almighty*. To him the Service of the Tabernacle and Temple was more immediate-

[b] Exod. xl. 34.—1 Kings viii. 10, 11. [c] Is. vi. 1, &c. [d] Matt. xxiv. 30. [e] xxv. 31.—Luke ix. 26. [f] 2 Thess. i. 7. [g] Μετ' ἀγγελων τῆι δυνάμεως αὐτῦ. [h] Gen. xviii. 1.—Psal. xcix. 1. [i] Psal. xxiv. 10.—2 Sam. vi. 2. [k] Psal. l. 1. [l] Psal. lxxviii. 56. [m] Gen. xvii. 1. xlviii. 3.

ly

ly offered: [n] to him Prayer was made, [o] Incenſe offered, [p] Sacrifices performed, [q] and Vows and Thankſgivings made.

The *Divinity of the Son of God* may be ſtill farther confirmed from Citations in the *New Teſtament* out of the *Old*, where what is ſpoken of *God* in the one is applied to *Chriſt* in the other. Thus we find in the firſt Chapter of [r] St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, a Prophecy from *Iſaiah*, which foretells that *a Virgin ſhall be with Child, and they ſhall call his Name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.* And, if we look into the Prophet, we ſhall find that this *Son* is not only called *Emmanuel*, but [s] *Wonderful, Counſellor, the mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace.* —— In the ſame Prophecy we read— [t] *Sanctify Jehovah the Lord of Hoſts himſelf, and let him be your Fear, and let him be your Dread. And he ſhall be for a Sanctuary: but for a Stone of ſtumbling, and for a Rock of Offence to both the Houſes of Iſrael.* — But

[n] Gen. xviii. 23, &c. 2 Kings xix. 15, &c. Pſal. lxxx. 1, &c. [o] Exod. xxx. 6, 7. [p] Lev. xvi. 2, &c. [q] Gen. xxviii. 20.—xxxi. 13. Pſal. i. 14.—xcix. 1, &c.— 1 Chron. xvi. 4. [r] Matt. i. 23. If. vii. 14. [s] ix. 6. [t] viii. 13, 14.

this

this Prophecy is applied to our *Bleſſed Saviour* both by [u] St. *Paul* and [w] St. *Peter*. They teach us that he is *the Stumbling Block and Rock of Offence* here ſpoken of; and therefore he is *Jehovah the Lord of Hoſts, our Fear, and our Dread.*

Again, [x] St. *Mark* in the Beginning of his Goſpel quotes two Prophecies, one from the Prophet *Malachi*, the other from *Iſaiah*. In *Malachi* we read — [y] *Behold I will ſend my Meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare the Way before me; and Jehovah, the Lord, whom ye ſeek, ſhall ſuddenly come to his Temple.*——But *John the Baptiſt* was this *Meſſenger*, who came to *prepare the Way before our Lord.* It appears therefore that *our Lord* is *Jehovah*, and that the Temple was *his Temple.* The other Prophecy we find in *Iſaiah*, ch. xl. v. 3. It there runs —— *The Voice of him that crieth in the Wilderneſs --- Prepare ye the Way of the Lord Jehovah, make ſtraight in the Deſart a Highway for our God.* —— This Prophecy is by [z] all the Evangeliſts ſaid to be fulfilled in *Chriſt.* He therefore is *Jehovah*; he is *our God.* It

u Rom. ix. 33. w 1 Pet. ii. 8. x Mark i. 2. 3.
y Mal. iii. 1. z Matt. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke iii. 4. John i. 23.

follows in the Prophet, ver. 5. *The Glory of the Lord ſhall be revealed, and all Fleſh ſhall ſee it together.*— He who was *the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory*, and reſided in *Glory* in the *Holy of Holies*, appeared now, and was revealed to all Mankind. In the 9th verſe the Prophet, continuing to ſpeak of the ſame great Event, thus expreſſeth himſelf ——*Say unto the the Cities of Judah, Behold your God; behold the Lord Jehovah will come with ſtrong Hand, and his Arm ſhall rule for him: behold his Reward is with him, and his Work before him. He ſhall feed his Flock like a Shepherd.* —*Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* therefore, [a] *the great Shepherd of the Sheep*, is *the Lord Jehovah*, is *the God of Judah and Jeruſalem.* [b] Another Prophecy we have in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel cited from the *Old Teſtament*, and applied to our *Bleſſed Saviour*. We find this in the Prophet [c] *Zechariah*. The whole Prophecy is delivered in the Perſon of *the Lord God Jehovah*. At ver. 12. we read — *They weighed for my Price thirty Pieces of Silver. And the Lord Jehovah ſaid unto me, Caſt it unto the Potter; a goodly Price that I was priſed at of them.*——This Prophecy the Evangeliſt tells

[a] Heb. xiii. 20.
[b] Matt. xxvii. 9, 10.
[c] Zech. xi. 12, 13.

us

us *was fulfilled in Chriſt*. It follows that he is *Jehovah*, [d] *the Shepherd of Iſrael*, the *God*, *who* [e] *had made a Covenant with the People* of the *Jews*.

I am ſenſible that ſome learned Writers, who have been zealous Aſſertors of our *Lord's* true *Divinity*, have either neglected, or ſpoke ſlightingly, of the Proofs to be drawn from the *Old Teſtament*. Others have carried the Matter too far the other Way; and by inſiſting on Arguments, which will not bear Examination, have thrown no ſmall Diſcredit on the real Proofs of *our Lord's Divinity*, which may juſtly be drawn from the *Law*, *and the Prophets*, eſpecially when compared with the *New Teſtament*. I have offered ſuch Proofs as ſeem to me fully to ſhew that *our Lord* was *the God of Iſrael*, and the Object of their Worſhip: and I might have produced many more. I have alſo ſhewn that this was the conſtant Doctrine of the Primitive Church. How far this Doctrine was known to the *Patriarchs* and *Jews* of old, is a Queſtion which I cannot think we are concerned to reſolve. It might be ſufficient to ſay, that

[d] See ver. 7. [e] ver. 10.

many Gospel Doctrines ([i] as particularly that of the calling of the *Gentiles*) were contained in the *Scriptures* of the *Old Testament*, and now appear plainly to be deducible from thence, which yet *in former Ages were not made known unto the Sons of Men.* The Doctrine of a *Trinity* therefore might be wrapt up in the *Scriptures*, and yet remain a Secret, till it was unfolded by the *Revelation* of the *Gospel.* And if this were the Case, we, who *worship one God in Trinity*, worship the same *God*, as those did, who knew not the Distinction of *Persons* in the *Godhead.* But we have no Reason to think this was the Case. [k] Mr. *Lindsey* indeed asserts with great Confidence that *the Hebrews never dreamed of a Plurality in the Deity.* To use his own quaint Expressions, I humbly think that [l] *Jacob dreamt of it* more than once. *Jehovah, the God of Abraham, and Isaac*, appeared to him in *Bethel.* This Person, *Jacob* himself calls [m] *the Angel, which redeemed him from all Evil*; and says *the* [n] *Angel of God spake unto him in a Dream.* He could not therefore be the same Person with the *God*, whose *Angel* he was. And

[i] Vide Eph. iii. 1, &c. [k] Page 87. [l] Gen. xxviii. 12, &c.—xxxi. 11, &c. [m] Gen. xlviii. 16. [n] xxxi. 11.

yet

yet this ſame Perſon calls himſelf *Jehovah the God of Abraham, and Iſaac,* [o] *God Almighty. And* [p] *Jacob vowed a Vow to him,* and took him for *his God;* [q] erected *an Altar,* [r] and offered *a Drink-offering to him,* [s] *made Supplication,* and offered up Prayers to him. It ſhould ſeem therefore that *Jacob* more than *dreamt* of a *Second Perſon* in the *Godhead.* And it has been ſhewn that *Philo,* and other *Jews* in later Times, had ſome Notion of a Diſtinction of *Perſons* in the *Deity.* [f] It appears alſo from ſeveral Paſſages in the *New Teſtament,* that the Title of *the Son of God* was not unknown to the *Jews* in our *Saviour*'s Time. [t] They accuſed him of *Blaſphemy,* becauſe he called himſelf *the Son of God:* [u] and thought that to *call God his Father* was to *make himſelf equal with God.* But [w] we are told that *all the Jews of later Times cry out againſt ſuch an Imputation upon them, and their Anceſtors.* Yes: and ſo do the *Mahometans.* But we ſhall not be ſo complaiſant, as to give up the fundamental Articles of our Religion to

[o] Gen. xxxv. 11. [p] xxviii. 20. [q] xxxv. 7.
[r] Ib. v. 11. [s] xxxii. 9, &c.—Hoſ. xii. 4.
[f] Matt. xiv. 33. xvi. 16. John i. 34, 49. vi. 69. xi. 27.
[t] Matt. xxvi. 63, 65. John x. 36.
[u] John v. 18. [w] Page 88.

gratify

gratify either *Jews*, *Turks*, *Infidels*, or *Hereticks*. And whatever these *Jews* have advanced, or can advance, has been fully answered 1500 Years ago by *Justin Martyr*, and since by *Raymund Martini*, *Petrus Galatinus*, *Dr. Allix*, *Bishop Kidder*, *Grotius*, and many others.

Let us therefore now proceed to the *New Testament*. And here our *Apologist*'s chief Argument against the *Divinity*, and *Worship* of *Christ*, and what he repeats in several Places, is taken from our *Saviour*'s Behaviour during his Ministry. [x] He tells us that *Christ never referred the Jews to any other than the Lord God of their Fathers*; that *he in the most decisive Terms declares the Lord God to be one Person*, Matt. iv. 10. *and singly exclusive of all others to be the sole Object of Worship*. The Words — *One Person*---printed in *Italicks*, I find not in the Text cited, nor in any other. We worship *One God*, as well as he. [y] But he tells us that *our Saviour himself always prayed himself, and also directed Prayer to be made only to God the Father*; but *he forbad Men's offering Prayers* to himself; [z] that *he formally professes his Inferiority, and Depen-*

[x] Page 92. [y] P. 121. [z] P. 9.

dence;

dence; that he received his Being, and all his Powers from God, and leads Men by his Precepts, and Example, to look up to God the Father, as the ſole Author, and Source of all Bleſſings to all, and the ſole Object of ſupreme Adoration from all. Theſe Objections have been already ſufficiently anſwered by [a] Mr. *Bingham*, and ſtill more fully conſidered in my [b] Vindication: and to theſe it might be ſufficient to refer. But as this is the moſt plauſible Argument our *Apologiſt* has to offer, and the moſt likely to impoſe on common Readers, *it will not be grievous to me*, for their Sakes, *to write the ſame Things again.* [c] Let it then be conſidered that, when our *Saviour* entered on his Miniſtry, he found the *Jews* almoſt univerſally poſſeſſed with falſe Notions of the *Meſſiah*. They were all at that Time in Expectation of a temporal *Meſſiah*, who ſhould deliver them from the Power of the *Romans*, and *reſtore again the Kingdom to Iſrael.* And his own Diſciples were ſtrongly tinctured with theſe common Prejudices. Our *Lord* therefore found himſelf obliged to act

[a] Page 14, &c. [b] Part. ii. p. 37, &c.

[c] See our *Saviour's* Conduct with regard to this Point clearly explained, and juſtified, in Mr. *Locke's Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*.

with

with great Caution, and Reſerve. Had he openly, and publickly, declared that he was the *Meſſiah*, this would have been, to the Apprehenſion of the *Jews*, declaring himſelf a temporal Prince: and all, who were convinced by his Miracles, would have been ready to riſe, and take up Arms in his Cauſe; while on the other Hand the Government would have been alarmed, and proceeded againſt him as a Traitor, and a Rebel. For this Reaſon, though he took all Occaſions to give full Proof of his Miniſtry, he choſe rather to intimate, than openly declare that he was the *Chriſt*. In like Manner, and for the ſame Reaſons, we find his *Divinity* rather ſtrongly intimated, than expreſsly taught. The Title, which he moſt commonly choſe to diſtinguiſh himſelf by, was that of *the Son of Man*. He is generally thought hereby to refer to *Dan.* vii. 13. where the *Meſſiah* is deſcribed as *one like the Son of Man coming with the Clouds of Heaven*, &c. And he ſeems to have choſen this Appellation, as carrying with it (eſpecially in his Manner of uſing, and applying it) ſufficient Intimation that he was the *Meſſiah* and yet the moſt humble Title that he could chooſe, and that which could give the leaſt Offence. But though he calls himſelf *the Son*

of

of Man, he aſcribes to this *Son of Man* ſuch Actions, and Powers, as plainly denote him to be more than *Man*. [d] This *Son of Man came down from Heaven*: [e] *he had Power on Earth to forgive Sins*. [f] *Angels ſhould be ſeen aſcending and deſcending on this Son of Man*: [g] and he himſelf ſhould be *ſeen aſcending up where he was before*. [h] *No Man* (ſaith our *Lord* to *Nicodemus*) *hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven*. —[i] This *Son of Man ſhould come in his Glory, and all the holy Angels with him, and ſhould reward every Man according to his Works*.——[k] This *Son of Man* was alſo *the Son, the Only-begotten Son of God*. And we find that during his whole Miniſtry [l] he ſpake with *Authority*: and both delivered Doctrines, and wrought Miracles, in his own Name. [m] *Verily I ſay unto you*—was the Form, in which he uſhered in his Precepts. And he took on him by his own Authority to explain, and add to, the Laws of *God* himſelf. And in the ſame authoritative Manner he wrought his Miracles.

[d] John vi. 3, 8. [e] Matt. ix. 6. [f] John i. 51. [g] John vi. 62. [h] iii. 13. [i] Matt. xxv. 31.—xvi. 27. [k] John iii. 16. [l] Matt. vii. 29. [m] Matt. v. 18. &c.

To the Man ſick of the Palſy he ſaid—[n] *Ariſe, take up thy Bed; thy Sins be forgiven thee.*—And, when the *Jews* accuſed him of *Blaſphemy*, becauſe he took upon him to *forgive Sins*, which was the Prerogative of *God only*, he anſwered that by the ſame Power, by which he wrought his Miracles, he was empowered *to forgive Sins alſo.* [o] To *the Leper*, who ſaid, *Lord, if thou wilt thou canſt make me clean, he ſaid—I will: be thou clean.*——[p] To the *Dead he ſaid—I ſay unto thee, Ariſe.* [q] *He* alſo *rebuked the Wind, and ſaid unto the Sea---Peace, be ſtill: and the Wind, and the Sea, obeyed him.*—[r] And he *commanded with Authority even the unclean Spirits, ſaying, Come out of the Man, thou unclean Spirit.*—And this is a Power, which no Man, either before, or ſince, either aſſumed, or exerciſed. [s] Though *Moſes* is ſaid to be *made a God to Pharaoh*, yet he wrought no Miracles, and delivered no Doctrines, in his own Name. His Miracles are expreſsly aſcribed to *the Lord*, and his Laws all delivered by *God* himſelf. The Prophets none of them ſpake in their own Name, but in the Name of *the Lord.*

[n] Matt. ix. 2, &c.—Mar. ii. 3, &c. [o] Matt. viii. 2, &c.
[p] Mark v. 41. Luke vii. 14. [q] Mark iv. 39.
[r] Mark i. 27.—v. 8. [s] Exod. vii. 1.

The

The Form they uſed was——*Thus ſaith the Lord.* [t] And the Apoſtles declare that they wrought their Miracles, *not by their own Power, or Holineſs,* but *by the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.* Another Means he uſed of notifying his *Divinity* was by calling *God* in a particular Manner his *Father* on all Occaſions. [u] He calls himſelf *the Son of God,* [w] *his one Son, his Well-beloved,* [x] *his Only-begotten Son*; and his Apoſtle calls him *his own proper Son.*

[y] If ſuch Titles as theſe import not an Equality of Nature, it will be hard to ſay what Idea they were deſigned to convey to us. Other Beings may be, and have been, called the *Sons of God* in a figurative, and improper Senſe. But he, who is *God's own proper Son, his one, his Only-begotten Son,* is the *Son of God* in ſuch a Senſe as no Creature is, or can be. Again, [z] our *Saviour* thus addreſſed himſelf to the *Jews,* who accuſed him

t Acts iii. 12, &c. [u] Matt. xxvi. 63, 64. Luke xxii. 70. John v. 17, &c.—ix. 35, &c.—x. 25, &c.

w Mar. xii. 6. [x] John iii. 16, 18.—ὁ υἱὸς, Rom. viii. 32. See alſo Matt. iii. 17.—xvii. 5. John i. 14, 18. 1 John iv. 9.

y See my Vindication, p. 10, 11. *Bull* Judic. Eccl. Cathol. C. v. *Pearſon* on the Creed, p. 138, &c.

z John v. 17, &c. See my Vindic. p. 38, &c.

of *breaking the Sabbath*, by *healing an impotent Man* on that Day—— *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*---*The Jews*, offended at this Speech, *ſought to kill him, becauſe he not only had broken the Sabbath, but ſaid alſo that God was his Father, his own proper Father*---Πατέρα ἴδιον---*making himſelf equal with God.* [a] That the *Jews* underſtood him to aſſume an *Equality*, not of Power or Authority only, but of Nature, is evident, becauſe their Charge is founded on his calling *God*---ἴδιον Πατέρα --- *his own proper Father.* But what does our *Lord* reply to this? Does he tell the *Jews* that they miſunderſtood him? Does he explain what he meant by calling *God his Father?* Does he deny that this imported an *Equality* with *the Father?* Something of this Kind ſurely it would have been proper, and neceſſary, for him to have done, had he been only a Creature. Inſtead of this he continues to make Uſe of the ſame offenſive Term; and that in ſuch a Manner, as to intimate ſtill more ſtrongly the cloſeſt Con-

[a] Dr. *Clarke* allows, that *it is very reaſonable to conceive that Jeſus in this Place, by calling God his Father in ſo abſolute, and particular a Manner might intend to hint to his Diſciples, what they could not then, but were afterwards to underſtand, that he was*—Λογος Θεος—*that Word, which was in the Beginning with God, and was God.* Script. Doctr. N° 580.

junction

junction between him and his *Father* —— *Verily, verily I say unto you, that the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise* ---ὁμοίως--- *For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth.*—— But does not our *Saviour* here *professs his Inferiority, and Dependence, that he received his Being, and all his Powers from God?* He does *professs an Inferiority and Dependence* with regard to his Office of *Messiah* here on Earth. Our *Lord* acted as *the Father*'s Delegate, and Embassador, with regard to his mediatorial Office. He was sent by *the Father*; and did nothing but by his Commission. And this was very proper to insist on in Answer to the *Jews*, who had accused him of Blasphemy, that he had done and said nothing but by Authority, and Commission, from the *Father*. --- *Verily, verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do.*-- And this surely would have been sufficient, had he been only a Prophet, or a created Angel sent on an Embassy to Mankind. To what Purpose then does he add --- *Whatsoever things he doeth, these also the Son doeth likewise --- the Father sheweth him all things*

that

that himſelf doth---the Son quickeneth whom he will--that all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. Could a Creature with any Propriety, or Decency, aſſume to himſelf ſo much? Is it indeed poſſible that any Creature ſhould be enabled to do *whatever the Supreme God doth?* and that too --- ὁμοιως---*in the like Manner*, or that *the Supreme God* ſhould *ſhew* to a Creature *all things that he himſelf doth?* Can *Omnipotence*, or *Omniſcience*, be communicated? or if they can, why may not alſo the *Divine Eſſence* be communicated? Again, would it not have been the higheſt Preſumption in any created Being to require *all Men to honour him, even as they honour the Supreme God?* [b] But we are told that the *Jews*, when they accuſed our *Saviour* of *making himſelf God, and equal with God, meant nothing more than his aſſuming a divine Power, and Authority, without any Warrant for it.* But this is a Senſe, which the Words will not bear. A falſe Prophet, who falſely pretends to ſpeak and act by *God's* Authority, cannot be ſaid thereby to *make himſelf God*, or *equal with God.* So far from this, that according to our Author himſelf,

[b] Apol. pag. 7.

he

he thereby *formally profeſſes his Inferiority and Dependence upon God.* No: they charged him with *making himſelf equal with God,* becauſe he *called God his own proper Father.* [c] At another Time they accuſed him of *Blaſphemy, becauſe he being a Man made himſelf God.* Their Meaning is ſo plain, that one would think it could not be well miſtaken. A falſe Prophet might juſtly be charged with Lying, but ſurely not with *Blaſphemy:* nor could he, by falſely ſpeaking in *God*'s Name, be ſuppoſed to mean to make *himſelf God.* And [d] ſo alſo, when our *Lord* was brought before *the Chief Prieſts and Elders,* they charged him with *Blaſphemy,* not for teaching *without Warrant,* but becauſe he profeſſed himſelf to be *the Son of God.* [e] And when *our Lord ſaid unto the Sick of the Palſy, Son, thy Sins be forgiven thee, the Scribes reaſoned in their Hearts, — Why doth this Man thus ſpeak Blaſphemies? Who can forgive Sins but God only.*—It is plain therefore that the *Jews* underſtood our *Saviour,* as aſſuming to himſelf a true and proper *Divinity.*

[c] John x. 33.
[d] Matt. xxvi. 63, &c.
[e] Mark ii. 5, 6.

But

But what ſhall we ſay to thoſe Words of our *Saviour*, [f] *that all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father?*——Dr. *Clarke* paraphraſes them, *that it is the Will of God the Father that the Son ſhould be honoured with the ſame Faith, and Obedience* [to which I beg Leave to add--and the ſame Worſhip] *which he requires to be paid to himſelf.* [g] But Mr. *Lindſey* tells us, that the *Honour to be paid to him was not ſo much on his own account, as out of Reſpect to God, who had ſent*

[f] *Grotius* thus remarks in his *Annotations* on this Paſſage—*Ut ſcilicet homines cognitâ hâc Filii poteſtate eum colant, ac revereantur — Tacite oſtendit Chriſtus quam intimus ſit Patri: nam Deus honorem ſuum extraneo non concedit.*——To the ſame Purpoſe ſpeaks Dr. *Whitby*, who alſo quotes a *Socinian* Writer *Woltzogenius*, who proves from this Paſſage the Neceſſity of worſhipping *Chriſt*. See alſo *Waterland*'s Def. of Q. 19.

[g] Mr. *Lindſey* quotes *Origen* in Support of his Interpretation. He could not have referred to an Authority more directly againſt him. *Origen* is here pleading for the Worſhip of *Chriſt*, in Oppoſition to that of *Dæmons* and *Heroes*. He aſks *Celſus what Command of God he could produce to honour ſuch as God's*. On the other Hand, he ſays that *God had commanded Chriſtians to honour the Son even as they honour the Father.*—Does it not then appear, from Mr. *Lindſey*'s own Quotation, that *Origen* thought *Chriſt* was to be *worſhipped?* But if we look a little farther we ſhall find him ſaying — If *Celſus had underſtood this—I and my Father are One—he would not have thought that we worſhipped any other than the Supreme God—we worſhip therefore One God, the Father, and the Son.*

him.

him. But how does he infer this? If *the Father* has *ſent his Son into the World,* and *he and the Father are one,* the *Honour,* which is paid to one, is paid alſo to the other, and *he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which ſent him.* Beſides, the Queſtion here is not what the Words, if taken by themſelves, might poſſibly ſignify, but what they muſt ſignify, as here introduced. Our Lord was accuſed of *making himſelf equal with God.* If the Charge were falſe he would doubtleſs have poſitively, and earneſtly, denied it. Inſtead of this, ſuch Interpreters repreſent him as continuing to diſcourſe in equivocal Terms, ſuch as might give his Hearers room to imagine that he was *really equal with God,* only leaving himſelf a Subterfuge, and Evaſion, whereby he might bring himſelf off: requiring *all Men to honour him, as they honour the Father*—but meaning no more, than what Kings and Magiſtrates, and all, to whom *Honour* is due, might claim. If we ſuppoſe our *Saviour* to be only a Creature, it would be difficult to reconcile ſuch a Procedure, either with his Duty to *God,* or Sincerity to Men. But if he was truly and really *God,* this his Diſcourſe is very proper, and pertinent. He vindicates what he had done by ſaying that he had not

done, nor pretended to do, any thing, but after the Example of, and by Commiſſion from, *God his Father.* And he gives full Proof that he had ſuch Commiſſion. At the ſame Time he departs not from his Claim, but all along gives ſtrong Intimation that he was really, what they accuſed him of *making himſelf, equal with God.*

In the ſame Manner our *Saviour* behaved on other Occaſions—[h] *As the Father knoweth me, even ſo know I the Father*—ſaid our *Lord* to the *Jews.* Again — [i] *My Sheep hear my Voice, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal Life, and they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any one pluck them out of my Hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all: and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's Hand. I and my Father are One.*——Strange Language this ſurely for a Creature: ſuch as I am perſuaded Mr. *Lindſey* would not uſe with regard to *his Sheep.* And yet he might, if they mean no more than that *God had ſent him,* and would protect him in the Execution of *the important Office committed to him.* The *Jews* certainly

[h] John x. 15. [i] Ibid. ver. 27, &c.

under-

underſtood him to mean that he was equal to *God the Father*. *They took up Stones to ſtone him:* and they ſaid, *they ſtoned him for Blaſphemy, and becauſe that he, being a Man, made himſelf God.* But poſſibly our *Saviour*'s Anſwer may be thought to imply that he was *God* only in an inferior Senſe — [k] *Jeſus anſwered them, Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid, Ye are Gods?*—Had indeed *Jeſus* ſtopt here, or had he gone on to plead that he was *God* only in the ſame, or a like Senſe to that, in which Judges, and Magiſtrates, are ſtyled *Gods*, there would then have been ſome Reaſon to believe that he was only a figurative, or ſecondary, *God*. And this doubtleſs, if he had not been really *God*, he would have pleaded. This would, on this Suppoſition, have been neceſſary for him to do, and that in expreſs Terms, to avoid giving Offence to the *Jews*, and to clear himſelf from the Charge of *Blaſphemy*. But inſtead of this, he proceeds ſtill farther to offend them. He gives them to underſtand that he is *the Son of God* in an higher Manner, than thoſe, *unto whom the Word of God came* of old. *If he called them Gods*, &c. *ſay ye of him, whom the*

[k] John x. 34, &c.

Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God.—This Anſwer of our *Lord* is plainly deſigned to evade the Malice of the *Jews*, and ward off their Accuſation: and is yet ſo worded, as to intimate both his *Meſſiahſhip*, and his Superiority over all who are *called Gods*. He tells them that Judges, and others acting under *God*'s Commiſſion, are in *Scripture called Gods:* and therefore no Charge of *Blaſphemy* could lie againſt him, becauſe he ſaid, he was *the Son of God*. But then at the ſame time he ſignifies to them that he had ſtill a higher Right to this Title, *he whom the Father had ſanctified and ſent into the World*. He here continues to aſſert that *God* was his *Father* in a peculiar Manner, and that he was ſo, before he came into the World—*he whom the Father had ſanctified, and ſent into the World*. He adds another Reaſon, not to excuſe, but to juſtify what he had ſaid—*If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not*, &c. He again calls *God* his *Father*, and appeals to his *Works*, as a Proof that *he and his Father were one*. And from hence therefore, he tells them *that they might know, and believe, that the Father was in him, and he in the Father*. We ſee here he neither

retracts,

retracts, nor excuſes, what he had ſaid before, nor does he ſay that the *Jews* falſely charged him with *making himſelf God.* Inſtead of this, he enforces what he had ſaid in Terms equivalent — *the Father is in me, and I in him.* [1] His Anſwer therefore taken altogether, inſtead of a Denial, carries with it a ſtrong Confirmation of his *Divinity.* But it may be ſaid that theſe Expreſſions may ſignify no more than *God*'s Preſence, and Aſſiſtance, always attending him, as in other Places of *Scripture* Men are ſaid to *dwell in God, and God in them.* It is true that theſe Phraſes, as indeed moſt others, may, as differently applied, have different Significations. We ought therefore here, as in the former Inſtance, to conſider the Deſign, and Occaſion, on which they were ſpoken. They

[1] This is no novel Interpretation. *Novatian,* an Author of the third Century, gives the ſame Senſe of the Words — *Si illos,* inquit, *dixit Deos,* &c. *quibus vocibus neque ſe negavit Deum, quin imo ſe Deum eſſe firmavit. Nam quia ſine dubitatione dixit Deos, ad quos verba facta ſunt, multo magis hic Deus qui melior illis invenitur. Et nihilo minus calumnioſam blaſphemiam diſpoſitione legitimâ congruenter refutavit. — Ita quod ad crimen blaſphemiæ pertinet, Filium ſe, non Patrem dicit, quod autem ad divinitatem ſpectet ipſius, ego et Pater unum ſumus dicendo, Filium ſe eſſe et Deum probavit. Deus eſt ergo.* De Trin. Lib. cap. 23. See alſo *Bull* Jud. Eccleſ. Cath. Cap. v. ſ. 6. *Maldonat. Whitby* Annot. *Payne* Serm. on *John* x. 36.

were

were ſpoken by one, who had already given Offence by calling *God his Father*, and ſaying that *he and his Father were one:* they were ſpoken to the *Jews*, who accuſed him of *Blaſphemy*, and *making himſelf God.* In ſuch Circumſtances therefore, if he had not been *God*, he ſurely would not have uſed ſuch Phraſes, as ſhould ſeem to import his *Divinity*, and as he knew the *Jews* would underſtand in that Senſe. They were, we ſee, highly offended, and *ſought again to take him.* They underſtood him to mean that he was *equal with God:* nor did our *Lord*, either now, or (as far as we can find) on any other Occaſion, vindicate himſelf, or correct their Miſtake.

I ſhall produce one more Place, where our *Saviour* ſets forth his *Divinity* in Terms ſtill more plain. We find in *Joh.* viii. a Dialogue recorded between our *Lord*, and the *Jews.* [m] They were much offended at his ſpeaking in ſuch an authoritative Style—— *If a Man keep my Saying he ſhall never ſee Death:* and aſked him—*Art thou greater than our Father Abraham and the Prophets—whom makeſt thou*

[m] John viii, 51, &c.

thyſelf?

thyſelf? — *Jeſus* denies not the Conſequence drawn from his Words, but vindicates it. — *Your Father Abraham rejoiced to ſee my Day: and he ſaw it, and was glad.* — The *Jews* underſtood him to mean that he was actually in Being in *Abraham*'s Time. — *They ſaid unto him, Thou art not yet fifty Years old, and haſt thou ſeen Abraham?* Does our *Lord* then correct their Miſtake? Does he tell them that he exiſted only in the divine Decree, as every one of them did? No. He aſſerts his Pre-exiſtence in ſtill higher Terms --- Verily, verily I ſay unto you, *Before Abraham was,* I AM. It is introduced with great Solemnity, as an important Truth --- *Verily, verily I ſay unto you:* --- and the Expreſſion is remarkable--- πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι--- Here is plainly an Oppoſition between γενέσθαι and εἰμι --- *Abraham was made,* was a Creature --- πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι --- but — I AM — Ἐγὼ εἰμι-- ſaith our *Lord.* He uſes alſo the Preſent Tenſe—I AM— not *I was*— which the *Jews* could not but know was the very Expreſſion which [n] *God* himſelf uſed to denote his neceſſary Exiſtence. He could not well have declared to them, both his *Pre-exiſtence* and

[n] Exod. iii. 14.

his

his *Divinity* in ſtronger Terms. And they accordingly did ſo underſtand him: *they took up Stones to caſt at him.* Here again then we muſt aſk, if our *Lord* was only a created Being, how came he ſo frequently to uſe ſuch Language, as he muſt know the *Jews* would interpret to be *making himſelf equal with God?* How came he to delight to border ſo near upon *Blaſphemy?* How came he to give ſuch unneceſſary Offence to theſe *Jews*, to exaſperate them againſt himſelf, and his Goſpel, without Cauſe, and ſo often expoſe his Perſon to Danger, without any conceivable Reaſon? If he was *very God of very God*, we need not wonder that he ſhould take all Occaſions of intimating this great Truth. But, if he was only a Creature, I could wiſh that thoſe who think him ſo would give ſome Account of this his Conduct. I ſhould be glad to ſee how they can, on their Principles, vindicate him from the Charge of Folly, and Raſhneſs, not to ſay Arrogance, and Preſumption.

Nay we find him diſcourſing in the ſame Style to his own Diſciples——° *He that hath*

° John xiv. 9. 10, &c.

ſeen

ſeen me hath ſeen the Father——*I am in the Father, and the Father in me.* — [p] *All things that the Father hath are mine.* —— And, as they acknowledged him to be *the Son of God*, which the *Jews* thought imported an *Equality with God*, he accepted, and approved of, this their Profeſſion. [q] *Nathanael* finding that he knew perfectly what was done in ſecret, cried out——*Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael.*—— [r] *Peter* acknowledged that he was *Chriſt the Son of the living God:* and our *Lord* approved of this his Confeſſion. [s] *Martha ſaid unto him, I believe that thou art the Chriſt the Son of God.* [t] *Thomas*, when convinced of the Reality of his Reſurrection, *anſwered, and ſaid unto him, My Lord, and my God.* —— Mr. *Lindſey* would willingly explain away this full Acknowledgment of our *Lord's Divinity.* [u] He quotes an anonymous Writer, as ſaying that this was only an Exclamation of *Aſtoniſhment*, or *Thankſgiving to God, who raiſed Chriſt from the Dead.* [w] But the Words

[p] John xvi. 15. [q] John i. 49. [r] Matt. xvi. 16. [s] John xi. 27. [t] John xx. 28.

[u] Pag. 27.

[w] Dr. *Clarke* thus paraphraſes the Text — *Thou art indeed my Lord, the ſame that was crucified; and I acknowledge thy*

 Almighty

will not bear this Senſe —— *He anſwered, and ſaid unto Him*, to *Jeſus:* and therefore *Him* he calls *his Lord, and his God.* And this Confeſſion of Faith our *Saviour* accepted, and approved of: by which Acceptance he declared himſelf both *Lord, and God.* [x] And he himſelf, when interrogated by the High *Prieſt*, whether he were *the Son of God*, anſwered, *Ye ſay that I am.* What they meant by the Queſtion is plain. They thought this Confeſſion no leſs than *Blaſphemy.*

From what has been ſaid, we may find an eaſy Anſwer to all that our *Apologiſt* has objected on this Head. If our *Lord* does not ſay in expreſs Terms that he is *God*, yet he gave both his *Diſciples*, and the *Jews*, to underſtand as much, in Language not eaſy to be miſtaken, and which they well underſtood. If he *profeſſes his Inferiority*, and *Dependence*, we have ſeen in what Reſpects, and for what Reaſons he does ſo. He appeared on Earth in *the Form of a Servant*, ſent with a Com-

Almighty Power in having triumphed over Death, and adore thee as my God. And thus Dr. *Hammond* — *I acknowledge that thou art my very Lord and Maſter, and that is an Evidence that thou art the Omnipotent God of Heaven.*——See alſo *Whitby*'s Annot. *Pearſon* on the Creed, Art. ii. p. 131.

[x] Luke xxii. 70.

miſſion

miſſion from *the Father* to reveal his Will to Mankind. It was neceſſary therefore that he ſhould ſet forth by whoſe Commiſſion he acted in this Capacity. If he ſays to his Diſciples — [y] *the Father is greater than I* — the Context will ſhew in what Reſpect he ſpeaks of himſelf. Theſe Words were ſpoken by him to comfort his Diſciples, troubled at the Proſpect of his approaching Departure. He was now about to leave the World, and *go unto his Father.* He bids them *rejoice* at his Departure, becauſe it would be the Means of advancing him to an higher Condition than that, in which, as Man, he now was. He acted here only in an inferior Capacity, and could do no more than what he was commiſſioned by the *Father* here to do. His Return to his *Father* would contribute to his Advancement with regard to his mediatorial Office, and enable him to pour forth greater Gifts on his Diſciples. As *the Son of Man* therefore, ſent by *God*, he was inferior to him that ſent him --- *mittens miſſo* ---as *Grotius* expreſſes it. And in this Capacity it was alſo neceſſary for him to pray to the *Father*. *He was made in the Likeneſs of Man,* [z] ſubject

[y] John xiv. 28. See *Hammond, Grotius, Whitby* Annot.
[z] Heb. iv. 15.

to all the Wants and Infirmities of human Nature, Sin only excepted. [a] And therefore it became him, *in the Days of his Flesh, though he were a Son, to offer up Prayers and Supplications to the Father.* Nor could he, for the Reasons already alledged, teach or direct his Disciples to worship him, while he appeared here on Earth in the Form of a Man. He directed them to offer up their Prayers to *their Father which was in Heaven:* but we are not therefore to imagine that every thing, which our *Lord,* appearing in our Earth, and acting in his ministerial Capacity, attributes to the *Father,* is so to be appropriated to the Person of the *Father,* as to exclude the other two Persons in the *Trinity.* Nor is the *Lord's Prayer,* though an excellent Form, and Pattern of Prayer, designed to forbid us the Use of any other Form. If it does not direct us to pray to *Christ,* so does it not direct us to offer up Prayers in his Name, which yet Mr. *Lindsey* himself seems to think necessary. [b] But we are told that *our Saviour Christ seems in Words, as express as can be used, to forbid Mens offering up Prayer to himself:* and for this *Joh.* xvi. 23. is quoted —

[a] Heb. v. 7, 8. [b] Page 121.

In

In that Day ye ſhall aſk me nothing. But the Word in the Original is ἐρωτήσετε. The Verb ἐρωτᾶν, though ſometimes it may ſignify *to petition*, yet in it's moſt common Acceptation ſignifies *to interrogate*, or aſk a Queſtion. And that it ſignifies ſo here is plain from what went before. [c] The *Diſciples* had Doubts about the Meaning of what our *Saviour* had ſaid to them, and *were deſirous to aſk him* — ἐρωτᾶν—— *Jeſus*, who knew their Thoughts, ---*vi ſuâ divinâ*--- as *Grotius* ſays, tells them, that though *they might weep, and lament* at his Departure, yet *their Sorrow would be turned into Joy, and their Joy no Man ſhould take from them.* Then he adds—*In that Day*— ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν — [d] *In that Day ye ſhall have no Occaſion to aſk me any Queſtions.* The Words that follow begin a new Sentence, as appears by the Introduction—*Verily, verily I ſay unto you---whatſoever ye ſhall aſk the Father* in my Name, he will give it you: and here the Word is not ἐρωτήσετε, but αἰτήσετε. His Deſign was to comfort his *Diſciples*, grieved at the News of his Departure. He tells them that though they could not then apply to him perſonally for Information, yet they would

[c] V. 19, &c. [d] See *Whitby*, *Hammond* Annot.

have

have free Acceſs to the *Father* through his Interceſſion, and *he would give them whatſoever they ſhould aſk.* [e] He had ſaid the ſame thing before, and there the Expreſſion was—*If ye ſhall aſk any thing in my Name, I will do it.*---And in this Senſe *his Diſciples* underſtood him. [f] They ſaid ---*Now are we ſure that thou knoweſt all things, and needeſt not that any Man ſhould aſk thee* —ἐρωτᾷ— *by this we believe that thou cameſt forth from God.*--- As he knew their Thoughts without aſking, they were convinced of his Divine Power, and Omniſcience --- *Divinum eſt introſpicere cogitata*---again ſays *Grotius.*

And, if he gave no expreſs Command to his Diſciples concerning his own Worſhip, yet I think it appears that they acknowledged his *Divinity,* and worſhipped him. I know the Word --- προσκυνέω --- often ſignifies civil Homage: but what ſhall we ſay when we find it joined with an Acknowledgment of our *Lord*'s divine Power? [g] When our *Saviour* cauſed *the boiſterous Wind to ceaſe, his Diſciples, who were in the Ship, came and worſhipped him, ſaying, Of a Truth thou art*

[e] Ch. xiv. 13, 14. [f] xvi. 30. [g] Matt. xiv. 33.

the

the Son of God. ——[h] *The blind Man,* whom *Jeſus* healed, when our *Lord* told him that he was *the Son of God, worſhipped him.*——[i] When our *Lord* was taken up into Heaven, and was no longer preſent with them on Earth, his Diſciples *worſhipped him.* St. *Thomas*'s Confeſſion, if it ſhould not be allowed to be a proper Invocation, yet, as we juſt now obſerved, was an Acknowledgment of our *Lord's Divinity,* and accepted by him, as ſuch.

Again, [k] our *Saviour* aſſures his Diſciples, that, where *two or three are gathered together in his Name, there is he in the midſt of them.* But our *Apologiſt* will have this to mean no more than---*it would be the ſame as if he were amongſt them*---But this is not explaining, but adding to, *Scripture. I am in the midſt of them,* and *it is the ſame as if I was in the midſt of them*--- are two very different Propoſitions. But we are told *that our Lord could not intend to ſpeak of himſelf as the God who heareth Prayer, is evident from his ſpeaking of the Father in this very Place, as the Perſon, who was to grant their Petitions.* Our *Saviour,*

h John ix. 38. i Luke xxiv. 52. k Matt. xviii. 20.

as

as I apprehend, in this Place ſpeaks of himſelf as Mediator, and of the *Father*, as granting our Petitions through his Interceſſion. We do not therefore infer immediately from this Place that he is *the God who heareth Prayer*. But we infer from hence his *Omnipreſence*. *Wherever two or three are gathered together in his Name*, he is preſent, and may be applied to, as Mediator between them and the *Father*.

Laſtly, [l] Our *Bleſſed Lord*, when now about to aſcend into Heaven, aſſured his Apoſtles that *all Power was given to him in Heaven, and in Earth:* and gave them Commiſſion to [m] *make Diſciples of all Nations, by baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* He here joins himſelf and *the Holy Ghoſt* with the *Father* in the ſame Form of *Baptiſm*, the moſt ſolemn Act of Worſhip, whereby all Nations were to renounce their falſe *Gods*, and be initiated into the *Chriſtian* Faith. What muſt all Nations think was the Import, and Intention, of ſuch a Rite, but that inſtead of all thoſe *Deities*, which they had before

l Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. m Μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες.

bowed

bowed down to, they were now to ſerve, worſhip, and adore, *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. Baptiſm* is, as I ſaid, undoubtedly an Act of Worſhip. It is a ſolemn Form of entering into Covenant with *God*, and dedicating ourſelves to his Service. Since therefore we are equally, and indiſcriminately, *baptized in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, we devote ourſelves equally to the Service of each of theſe three Perſons. Here is no Diſtinction, or Limitation; no Intimation given that leſs Honour, or Homage, was hereby intended to be paid to the two laſt, than to the firſt of theſe three Perſons. I have before urged this Argument at large in my Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, P. ii. pag. 54, &c. It has alſo been frequently inſiſted on by other Writers, as particularly by [n] Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, [o] Dr. *Waterland*, [p] Dr. *Berriman*, *&c.* See alſo [q] Mr. *Bingham*'s Vindication.

And to this our Author has nothing to offer, but only Objections, which have been anſwered over and over again. [r] He ſays that

[n] Diſcourſe on the Trinity, Ch. ix. [o] Sermon viii. at Lady *Moyers* Lect. [p] Sermon vi. p. 116, &c.
[q] Pag. 36, &c. [r] Pag. 103.

our *Lord had taught his Disciples that there was One God the Father, and none other but he,* Mar. xii. 32. But---*the Father* --- is his own Addition: 'tis not to be found in the Text cited. We all believe there is *One only God, the Father unbegotten, the Son begotten of the Father, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father, and the Son.* * And with this our Belief of the *Unity*, the Doctrine of the *Trinity* has been frequently shewn to be no way inconsistent.

† We are told next, that the *Apostles* frequently *baptized only in the Name of Jesus Christ.* But how does this appear? His Examples from *Scripture* prove nothing. It will not follow, that because the *Name of Jesus Christ* only is mentioned, therefore the two other were omitted in the *Form of Baptism.* Nor can we believe that the Apostles did not obey our *Lord*'s express Command, but altered the *Form of Baptism,* which he had prescribed, only because the Form, in which they baptized, is not on every Occasion expressed at large. As Mr. *Bingham* has observed before me, these general Expressions

* See particularly *Waterland,* Sermon iv. on this very Text.
† Page 105.

of

of being *baptized into Chriſt*, or *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, are applicable to all of us, who have received the *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, even when the preſcribed Form was uſed. And he might as well argue that, becauſe the receiving the Communion is ſometimes expreſſed by *breaking of Bread*, therefore there was no Cup adminiſtred. And with the ſame ingenious Writer I alſo obſerve, that one of thoſe very Inſtances produced by our *Apologiſt* affords a ſtrong Proof that the Apoſtles *baptized in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt*. We read, *Acts* xix. that *Paul, finding certain Diſciples at Epheſus*, aſked them whether *they had received the Holy Ghoſt. And they ſaid unto him, We have not ſo much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghoſt. And he ſaid unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they ſaid, Unto John's Baptiſm.*

[u] But our Apologiſt tells us, that *the Nicene Council pronounced Baptiſm to be invalid, that was not performed in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt* --- flatly contrary to what appears to have been ſometime the Practice of the Apoſtles themſelves. What does he

[u] Page 106.

mean that this *Council* firſt *pronounced the Invalidity of ſuch Baptiſm.* This is contrary to all Hiſtory. How often has it been proved that this Form of *Baptiſm* has been invariably retained in the *Chriſtian* Church long before the *Council of Nice*, and always thought to import the *Divinity* of the Perſons, in whoſe Name *Baptiſm* was adminiſtred, and that long before *the Council of Nice.* [w] *Juſtin Martyr* bears witneſs, that in his Time *Chriſtians were baptized in the Name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* [x] He tells us alſo that *Chriſtians worſhipped and adored* theſe three Perſons, and therefore were unjuſtly called *Atheiſts. Tertullian* has a Treatiſe on *Baptiſm,* [y] in which he tells us that in *Baptiſm our Faith is ſealed in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*; and that *the Teſtimony of our Faith, and Covenant of our Salvation, is confirmed by Three.* The ſame [z] *Tertullian* in his Book againſt *Praxeas* ſays, that *our Lord commanded* his Apoſtles *to baptize in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, and not in one only:* and that it was therefore the Cuſtom of the

w Apol. ii. p. 94. x Ib. p. 56. y C. vi.
z C. xxvi.

Church

Church to *dip* the Perſon baptized, *not once only, but three Times, at the Name of each Perſon.* [a] *Hippolytus* in his Book againſt *Noetus* teaches *that we cannot otherwiſe believe in one God, unleſs we really believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; and ſays, that our Lord, knowing that the Father would be glorified only in this Manner, delivered, after he was riſen, the Form of Baptiſm to his Diſciples, ſhewing that whoever ſhould leave out one of the Three would not honour God perfectly, for by this Trinity the Father is glorified.*—— *Origen* [b] ſpeaking of *Baptiſm,* ſays that *it is the Fountain of ſpiritual Gifts, by virtue of the Invocations there made by every one, who dedicates himſelf to the Godhead of the adorable Trinity.* — And in his Comment on *Rom.* vi. 3. he obſerves that *what St. Paul here ſays of baptizing into Chriſt, does not denote any new Form of Baptiſm: for no other Form of Baptiſm was ever thought lawful, beſides that which was given in the Name of the adorable Trinity, according to the Command of Chriſt. And St. Paul* (he ſays) *is not ſpeaking of the Form of Baptiſm, but of Chriſt's Death, and our conforming to it, as ſignified in Baptiſm.*

[a] C. xiv. p. 16. [b] Comment in *Joh.* p. 124.

Cyprian,

Cyprian, in his Epiſtle to *Jubaianus*, ſays that *the Form of Baptiſm implies the Doctrine of the Trinity, in whoſe Sacrament Nations were to be baptized.* [d] In the ſame Epiſtle he aſſerts, that *the Baptiſm of Hereticks, who baptized in the Name of Chriſt only, was invalid. How* (ſays he) *can ſome ſay that a Perſon can obtain Remiſſion of Sins, if he be baptized only in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, ſince Chriſt commanded all Nations to be baptized in the compleat and undivided Trinity?* And he tells us that when St. *Peter* called upon the *Jews* to be *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, the Meaning was, *not that the Father ſhould be omitted, but that the Son ſhould be added to the Father*, in whoſe Name alone the *Jewiſh Baptiſm* ran. There is another remarkable Paſſage in this ſame Epiſtle. [e] He aſks *how any Perſon baptized by theſe Hereticks could be ſanctified, and made the Temple of God? Of what God* (ſays he) is he made the Temple? *If of the Creator, he cannot be ſo, who doth not believe in him. If of Chriſt, he cannot be his Temple, who denies Chriſt to be God. If of the Holy Ghoſt: but ſince* [f] *theſe three are one, how can he be at*

[c] Epiſt. 73. p. 200. [d] Ibid. p. 205—6.
[e] P. 203. [f] Here is a plain Reference to 1 John v. 7.

Peace

Peace with the Holy Ghoſt, who is at Enmity with the Father, or the Son? [g] It appears then from theſe early Writers, that the Form of *Baptiſm in the Name of the three Perſons in the Trinity*, was conſtantly uſed in the *Chriſtian* Church from the Beginning, and thought to import the *Divinity* of each Perſon, that it was judged to be the Practice of the Apoſtles themſelves, and that no other *Baptiſm* was thought valid. And yet our *Apologiſt* would repreſent the *Nicene Council* as firſt pronouncing *Baptiſm to be invalid*, which was not given in this Form, and runs Riot upon theſe *Fathers for ſetting up their Wiſdom againſt that of the Apoſtles*. But where has he his Hiſtory? I have looked into the Canons of the *Councils of Nice*, and can find no ſuch Decree. [h] Nor did *Arius*, or any of his Followers before *Eunomius*, uſe any other than the common Form of *Baptiſm*. There is indeed one Canon, the 19th, which ordains that the *Paulianiſts ſhall be re-baptized*: but the Reaſon for this is not ſpecified in the Canon. And they ſeem to refer to a Deciſion which had been made before. There

[g] See alſo *Bingham* Antiq. B. xi. C. 3. ſect. 2, 3. *Waterland* Serm. on Matt. xxviii. 19.

[h] *Bingham* Ibid. ſect 11.

had

had been a great Diſpute in the Church in the preceding Century about the *Re-baptization of Hereticks*. *Cyprian*, and others, had contended that all *Baptiſm* given by *Hereticks* was invalid. This Point was ſettled in the Council of *Arles*, held before that of *Nice*. They ordained that thoſe only ſhould be *re-baptized*, who had not been *baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*. And this, as we have already ſeen, was always thought neceſſary. [i] This is alſo aſſerted in the *Apoſtolical Canons*, which, though not enacted by the *Apoſtles*, are judged by learned Men to be more ancient than the *Council of Nice*. They ordain that *the Biſhop, or Prieſt, who does not baptize into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, and perform the three Ablutions of one Myſtery, but only one Ablution into the Death of Chriſt, ſhall be depoſed. For* (ſays the Canon) *our Lord ſaid not, Baptize into my Death, — but into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

We can ſtill produce farther Authority from an Heathen Writer. [k] In the Dialogue

[i] Canon 41, 42. [k] See Fabricius Biblioth. Græc. L. iv. c. 16. Voſſius de Hiſtor. Græc. L. ii. c. 11.

entitled

entitled *Philopatris*, aſcribed to *Lucian*, but certainly the Work of an Author of the ſecond Century, a *Chriſtian* is in a jeering Manner introduced, as catechiſing a *Heathen*. The *Heathen* aſks him — *Whom ſhall I ſwear by?* The *Chriſtian* anſwers—*By the God that reigns on high; the great, the immortal, the heavenly, the Son of the Father, the Spirit that proceedeth from the Father, one of three, and three of one; theſe believe to be Jupiter, theſe eſteem to be God.* [l] The *Adjuration* plainly refers, either to the Form of *Baptiſm*, or to the Profeſſions of Faith required of *Catechumens* before Baptiſm. And from hence it appears that Perſons embracing *Chriſtianity* devoted themſelves to the Service of the *Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*; and that the Doctrine of a *Trinity in Unity* was the received Doctrine among *Chriſtians* in thoſe early Times.

[m] Nay the Form of *Baptiſm* carried with it ſo ſtrong a Proof of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, that many of thoſe, who denied this Doctrine, judged it neceſſary to baptize in an-

[l] See *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. c. 4. No 11. *Waterland* Serm. on Matt. xxviii. 19.

[m] See *Bingham* Antiq. B. xi. ch. 3. *Waterland* as above.

other Form, as particularly *Eunomius*, and probably before him *Paul of Samosata*. [n] Some of these *baptized into the Death of Christ*: [o] *others in the Name of the Father uncreate, the Son created by the Father, and the sanctifying Spirit created by the Son.* A modern Author, taken Notice of by [p] Bishop *Bull*, was pleased to suggest a Suspicion that these Words—*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*——have been added to the Text. And he makes Use of the same Argument, as our Author, *viz.* that *the Apostles baptized only in the Name of our Lord Jesus.* These were more daring, and impious, but yet more open, and consistent, than those, who retain this Form, and yet [q] paraphrase it away into no more than *receiving Men to a Profession of the Belief, and an Obligation to the Practice of that Religion, which God the Father has revealed and taught by the Son, and confirmed and established by the Holy Ghost.* And I wonder that Mr. *Lindsey*, who has altered so many things in our Liturgy, should retain this Form, *so flatly con-*

[n] *Socrates* Hist. L. v. C. 24. [o] *Epiphan.* Hæres. 76.
[p] Posthumous Works Vol. iii. p. 850.
[q] Dr. *Clarke*'s Paraph.

trary

trary to what appears to him *to have been ſometimes the Practice of the Apoſtles themſelves.*

[r] But our *Apologiſt* does not think that *from the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, being thus named together with the Father, their Equality to each other may be inferred,* becauſe in ſome other *Paſſages of Scripture God and his Creatures are joined together.* To this old Objection I anſwer in the Words of the excellent Biſhop *Stillingfleet :* —— [s] " Can any Man of Senſe " imagine theſe Places contain a Parallel with " a Form of Words, wherein Men are en- " tered into the Profeſſion of a new Religion, " and by which they were to be diſtinguiſh- " ed from all other Religions ? In the former " Places the Circumſtances were ſo notorious " as to *God* and the Civil Magiſtrate, that it " ſhews no more than that the ſame exter- " nal Acts may be uſed to both, but with " ſuch a different Intention as all Men un- " derſtood it. What if St. *Paul* name the " *elect Angels* in a ſolemn Obteſtation to " *Timothy*, together with *God*, and the *Lord* " *Jeſus Chriſt?* What can this prove but

[r] Pag. 107. [s] Diſcourſe in Vindication of Doct. of Trinity, C. ix. p. 219. The like Anſwer is given by Mr. *Bingham.*

" that we may call *God*, and his Creatures to
" be Witneſſes together of the ſame thing?
" And ſo *Heaven and Earth* are called to bear
" Witneſs againſt obſtinate Sinners: may
" Men therefore be *baptized in the Name of*
" *God* and his Creatures? — So that theſe In-
" ſtances are very remote from the Purpoſe."

What our Author would infer from 1 *Cor.* i. 13. I am at a Loſs to comprehend. St. *Paul did not baptize the Corinthians in his own Name* — therefore—what? — If we had read that St. *Paul did baptize in his own Name*, this might have been to his Purpoſe.

[t] But our *Apologiſt* tells us, that his *Interpretation of the baptiſmal Form is confirmed by thoſe Summaries of Chriſtian Faith drawn up in the firſt Ages after Chriſt, particularly that called the Apoſtles Creed.* — And after quoting ſome ridiculous Reflections caſt on this *Creed* by ſome fooliſh *Jeſuits*, [u] he is pleaſed to ſay that *nothing could more expreſsly condemn the Doctrine of the divine undivided Trinity than this Creed of the Apoſtles; and hardly ſhall you meet with two greater Oppoſites than this Creed, and that which goes under the Name of*

[t] Page 108. [u] Page 112.

Athanaſius

Athanaſius—And yet he owns that *this Creed was not compoſed by the Apoſtles*; and thinks himſelf at Liberty to leave out of his *Liturgy* ſuch Articles of it as he pleaſes. [w] In another Place he tells us, that *the Creed called the Apoſtles, and the other Creeds of thoſe early Times, are a pregnant Proof that all Chriſtian People for upwards of three hundred Years after Chriſt, till the Council of Nice, were generally Unitarians, what is now called either Arian or Socinian.*—We have here very confident Aſſertions without the leaſt Proof. I defy him, or the ſubtleſt *Jeſuit* upon Earth, to point out any thing in *the Apoſtles Creed* contrary, either to the *Nicene*, or the *Athaſian Creed:* or ſhew any one Propoſition in theſe latter *Creeds*, which is *condemned* by the former. If the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is not expreſsly aſſerted in *the Apoſtles Creed*, ſo neither is the *Unity of the Godhead.—I believe in one God*—ſays the *Nicene* Creed—— *We worſhip one God*—ſays the *Athanaſian:*—— the *Apoſtles Creed* ſays not ſo much. Nor was this *Creed*, as our Author himſelf owns, compoſed by the *Apoſtles*. It is no other than the *Creed* of the *Church of Rome:* and it is

[w] Page 24.

not

not so old in it's present Form as the *Nicene Creed* is, Our *Apologist* refers us to *a Collection of Creeds to be found in* King's *Enquiry into the Worship of the Primitive Church.* I have not that Book by me: but I have the same learned Man's *Critical History of the Apostle's Creed,* where our Apologist may find a full Confutation of all that he has advanced on this Head. [x] That learned Author has shewn that, though the greatest Part of this *Creed* is of early Date, yet *the exact Form of the present Creed cannot pretend to be so antient as the Days of the Apostles by four hundred Years.* [y] He proves that this *Creed,* by calling *Christ the only Son of God,* sets forth that he is *the true and natural Son of God, begotten before all Worlds, in such a Way, or Manner, as never any other was, is, or can be:* and that *this Article of the Creed is coeval with Christianity itself, and denotes Christ's divine Nature.* [z] *Christ* cannot indeed be called *the only Son of God* in any other respect, but that of his *Divinity.* [a] He also says that *the Reason why so little is said of the Holy Ghost in this Creed, is because there was not so great a*

[x] Chap. i. p. 23, &c. [y] Chap. iii. p. 131, &c.
[z] See *Bull* Jud. Eccl. Cath. Cap. v. [a] Ch. vi. p. 318, &c.

Controversy

Controverſy in the Primitive Church concerning the Divinity, and Perſon, of the Holy Ghoſt: but that *his Divinity was intended by the Creed's requiring us to believe in him, whereas we are only required ſimply to believe the other Articles.*

[b] The learned Mr. *Bingham* in his Antiquities has given us a *Collection of the Creeds of theſe early Times.* The firſt I can find is in *Irenæus.* [c] He tells us that *Chriſtians at their Baptiſm received a certain and unalterable Rule of Faith from the Apoſtles*, which was to believe *in one God, the Father Almighty, who made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and all Things therein*; *and in one Chriſt Jeſus, the Son of God, who was made Fleſh for our Salvation, and in the Holy Ghoſt, who ſpake by the Prophets* --- and then follows ſoon after, in the ſame *Creed* --- *that every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth, to Chriſt Jeſus, our Lord, and God, and Saviour.* We have ſeveral Forms of Faith in *Tertullian*; one in his Book of *Preſcriptions againſt Hereticks*, another in his Book *De velandis Virginibus.* Theſe, though not the ſame, yet differ but little from the

[b] B. x, C. 4. [c] L, i. Cap. i. 1, &c.

Apoſtles

Apoſtles Creed. But we have ſtill another in his Book againſt *Praxeas*, which is more full and expreſs. [d] He there ſets forth the Faith of *Chriſtians*, as *believing in One God, but under this Diſpenſation, that the One God has a Son, his Word, who proceeded from him, by whom all Things were made, and without him nothing was made; that he was ſent by the Father, and born of the Virgin, both Man, and God, the Son of Man, and the Son of God, &c.* that *he ſent from his Father the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the Sanctifier of the Faith of all thoſe who believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. --- This Rule of Faith* (he ſays) *was delivered down from the Beginning of the Goſpel.* And afterwards he adds, that *we muſt keep the Myſtery of the Oeconomy, or Diſpenſation, which diſpoſes the Unity into a Trinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt---three of one Subſtance, State, and Power.* --- There is another Form of Apoſtolical Doctrine collected by *Origen* in his Book of *Chriſtian Principles.* There, among other things, *Chriſtians* are ſaid to believe that *there is one God, who created all things;* that *Jeſus Chriſt was born of the Father before all Creatures* --- that *being God, he was*

[d] Cap. ii.

made

made Flesh, and being Man, he continued the same God that he was before.—Lastly, he says that *the Apostles delivered that the Holy Ghost was associated to the Father and Son in Honour, and Dignity.* We have also among the Works of *Gregory*, commonly called *Thaumaturgus*, [e] a *Creed*, which he composed for the Use of his own Church, in which the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is most expressly asserted.—*There is One God, the Father of the living Word—And One Lord, One of One, God of God—And One Holy Ghost, having his Subsistence from God—A perfect Trinity, undivided, unseparated in Glory, Eternity, and Dominion* —— and a great deal more to the same Purpose. We have also another Confession of Faith of *Lucian* the Martyr, recorded by *Athanasius*, *Socrates*, and *Hilary*, which [f] (tho' the *Arians* falsely pretended there were some Expressions in it favourable to them,) plainly asserts the *Divinity* of *Christ*. It calls him *the Only-begotten Son of God, the God, by whom all Things were made, begotten of his Father before all Ages, God of God, whole of whole, One of One, Perfect of Perfect, &c.* —— I

[e] See the Genuineness of this Creed vindicated by Bp. *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. C. 12. n. 2, 3.

[f] Ibid. Sect, ii. C. 13.

ſhall mention only one more, and that is the *Creed of the Church of Jeruſalem*, as we have it in *Cyrill's Catechetical Lectures*. [g] This *Cyrill* was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* about the Middle of the fourth Century. This *Creed* muſt be older than the Lectures, which comment upon it. It differs from the *Nicene Creed*. It has not thoſe Articles, by which the *Nicene* Fathers guarded againſt the Errors of *Arius*, as — *conſubſtantial* — *very God of very God*; — and therefore muſt be more antient than this Council. It is probably the moſt antient perfect Form of a Creed publickly uſed in the Church now extant, and had been for ſome time the *Creed* of the Church of *Jeruſalem*. And yet this Creed calls *the Lord Jeſus the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all Worlds, the true God, by whom all things were made.* —— Theſe are *the Creeds of thoſe early Times*, which our *Apologiſt* refers to as *pregnant Proofs, that all Chriſtian People before the Council of Nice were Arians, or Socinians.* [h] But he thinks it *abſolutely neceſſary that the leſs learned ſhould be told ſo.* For theſe indeed his Performance is calculated. It is

[g] See *Bull* Jud. Eccl. Cath. C. vi.

the

the *unlearned and unſtable* only that he can hope to beguile. But let me deſire this *Inſtructor of the fooliſh and unlearned* to *teach himſelf.* Let him, if it is not too much Trouble, look into ſome of the Authors cited in the Margin [i].

The ſame Writers will inform him, that *Creeds* were originally Confeſſions of Faith made at Baptiſm; that in all Probability they at firſt contained no more than the Form of Baptiſm itſelf — *I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.* —— And this was more expreſſive of the *Divinity* of each Perſon than the more enlarged *Creeds*, whoſe additional Articles disjoined the Names of the three Perſons, but ſtill retaining the Expreſſion of *believing in* each Perſon. Soon after, other Articles were added, guarding againſt ſuch Errors, as from time to time ſprang up. Some of theſe Articles were probably inſerted in the Days of the Apoſtles themſelves.

i *Voſſius* de tribus Symbolis Differt. i. *Uſher* de Rom. Eccleſ. Symbol. Apoſt. Vet. *Bull* Jud. Eccleſ. Cath. Cap. iv. iv, v, vi. *Bingham* Antiq. B. x. Ch. 3 & 4. *King* Crit. Hiſt. of the Apoſtles Creed. *Wall* Hiſt. of Infant Baptiſm, P. ii. Ch. 9. ſ. 10, &c. *Stillingfleet* Vindic. Doct. Trin. Ch. ix. *Waterland* Sermon Matt. xxviii. 19. Import. Doct. Trin. Ch. vi.

Theſe *Creeds* were different in different Churches. In the *Roman Creed* the Article of—*Maker of Heaven and Earth*—was probably deſigned to guard againſt thoſe who held that the World was made by Angels, or by ſome evil Being. The ſeveral Articles relative to our *Lord*'s Birth, and Crucifixion, might be deſigned to exclude thoſe Hereticks, who denied our *Lord* to be really Man. In this *Creed* they thought it ſufficient to ſet forth our *Lord's Divinity*, by calling him *the only Son of God*; a Title, which can belong to no Creature. In the *Oriental Creeds*, as in thoſe Parts Hereticks aroſe, who denied the *Divinity* of our *Saviour*, this Doctrine appears to have been more explicitly expreſſed. The ſame Doctrine is contained in all the antient *Creeds:* and the latter are only explanatory of the former. We acknowledge then the *Apoſtle's Creed* to be an excellent Summary of the *Chriſtian Faith*, but we cannot argue from it negatively. We cannot conclude that nothing is neceſſary to be believed, but what is fully, and explicitly, therein contained: nor any Error dangerous, but what is therein expreſsly condemned. Our *Apologiſt* might as well tell us that this *Creed* condemns the *Proteſtant* Religion, becauſe the Errors of Popery

Popery are not therein ſo particularly guarded againſt, as in our Articles, and other *Proteſtant* Confeſſions of Faith.

I have now followed our *Apologiſt* through the *Goſpels:* I come now to the *Acts*, and *Epiſtles*. The *Divinity* of our *Bleſſed Saviour* is ſet forth in many Texts there, and the Proofs thereof ſet forth by many excellent Writers; and our Author's Exceptions ſufficiently obviated by Mr. *Bingham*, and the learned *Layman*. I ſhall therefore confine myſelf to ſuch as relate to the *Worſhip of Chriſt*. We have already ſeen that *the Diſciples worſhipped him* on his *Aſcenſion into Heaven:* and ſoon after we find them offering up a Prayer to him — [k] *They prayed, and ſaid, Thou Lord, which knoweſt the Hearts of all Men, ſhew whether of theſe two thou haſt choſen.* [l] This Prayer is, I think, addreſſed to *Chriſt*, not only becauſe the Word, *Lord*, was the uſual Appellation, by which they were wont to addreſs him, but becauſe [m] the *Apoſtles* were his Meſſengers, and it was he,

[k] Acts i. 24.

[l] See *Whitby*'s Annotat. who brings Proof of this from *Woltzogenius*, a *Socinian* Writer.

[m] Matt. x. 1, &c.—John xx. 21.

and

and he alone, who appointed them. And therefore he was the proper Perſon to apply to, to fill up the Vacancy. [n] And afterwards St. *Paul* was ordained *Apoſtle* by the ſpecial Appointment of *Chriſt* himſelf, who appeared to him. [o] Accordingly in the Beginning of almoſt all his *Epiſtles*, he ſtyles himſelf *an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt*, [p] and declares that from him he *received Grace and Apoſtleſhip*. And [q] St. *Peter*, and [r] St. *Jude*, call themſelves *the Apoſtles of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt* [s] But to this our *Apologiſt* has two Objections; *firſt*, *becauſe in a ſimilar Paſſage that follows ſoon after*, *the ſame Apoſtles addreſs their Prayer in the ſame Terms to God the Father*, *Acts* iv. 24, 29. But there is not in this Prayer one *Term*, nor one Word, the ſame, but only the Appellation of *Lord*. And ſurely it will never follow, that becauſe the *Apoſtles* ſometimes addreſſed their Prayers to *God the Father* particularly, and called him *Lord*, therefore they never called *Chriſt Lord*, and never addreſſed their Prayers to him. But, ſecondly, *Grotius* is quoted, as concluding that this Prayer is addreſſed to

[n] Acts ix. 1, &c. [o] 1 Cor. 1, &c. &c.
[p] Rom. i. 5. [q] 2 Pet. iii. 2. [r] Jude 17.
[s] Page 128.

God

God the Father, and not to *Chriſt*, becauſe the Perſon here addreſſed is ſaid to *know the Hearts of all Men*. But *Grotius* draws no ſuch Concluſion. He ſays indeed on this Paſſage---*It is the Prerogative of God only to judge certainly of the Hearts of all Men*. And that is all he ſays: he does not ſpecify to whom he thinks this Prayer addreſſed. *Grotius* moſt certainly acknowledged both the *Divinity*, and the *Omniſcience*, of our *Bleſſed Saviour:* and in his Comment on *John* ii. 25. where *Jeſus* is ſaid to *know what was in Man*, he ſays, that is, *in the inmoſt Receſſes of the Heart, which is the peculiar Prerogative of God*.—Nay, our Author himſelf acknowledges that *Chriſt ſaith of himſelf*, Rev. ii. 23. *I am he, which ſearcheth the Reins, and Hearts* —but then he adds, that *this is a derived Power*. And what then? If *Chriſt* had this Power, whether *derived* or *underived*, there is an End of his Objection. He might be the Perſon, to whom this Prayer is directed. Nay, if *this Power was entruſted with him for the Government of his Church*, he muſt be able to hear the Prayers of his *Church*. But I muſt carry this Argument ſtill farther. [t] *Chriſt* had

[t] See Matt. ix. 4.—xii. 25. Luke ix. 47. John ii. 24, 25. vi. 64.

the

the Power of *knowing Mens Hearts, and Thoughts,* long before his Aſcenſion. [u] He had juſt before given his Apoſtles Proof, and they had acknowledged that *he knew all things.* And therefore it is from hence moſt probable that he was the Perſon, whom they here addreſſed under the Character of him, who *knew the Hearts of all Men.* And we are not only taught in *Scripture* that *Chriſt* is *omniſcient,* but he in an emphatical Manner ſays of himſelf—[w] *I am he which ſearcheth the Reins and Hearts.*— This Text our Author quotes, and at the ſame time acknowledges that it is *the Prerogative of God alone to ſearch the Heart of Man. Chriſt* is therefore *God* by his own Confeſſion. I muſt indeed own myſelf at a Loſs to comprehend how the peculiar *Prerogatives of God* can be communicated to a Creature. If theſe Attributes are derived to the *Son,* ſo muſt alſo be his *eternal Power and Godhead:* and we muſt acknowledge him to be *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God.*

The next Prayer addreſſed to *Chriſt* was by St. *Stephen* at his Martyrdom, [x] when *he called upon Chriſt, ſaying, Lord Jeſus, receive*

[w] Rev. ii. 23. [x] Acts vii. 58.

my

my Spirit. Our Author acknowledges it to be *unqueſtionable* that St. *Stephen addreſſed this Prayer to the Lord Jeſus.* But he is ready at an Evaſion: he tells us that *he ſaw him with his Eyes.*—But where did he ſee him? not on Earth, but in *Heaven*—what a Space between? —— (to uſe his own Words) *He ſaw him with his Eyes*—but could he hope that *the Son of Man,* with ſuch *a Space between,* could hear him with his Ears.—A proper Anſwer this to ſuch a trifling Objection.—But to be ſerious. If our *Lord* could *hear in Heaven, his Dwelling-Place, the Supplications* made to him here on Earth, what better Proof can we deſire of his *Divinity?* It muſt be equally eaſy to him to hear thoſe who *ſee him not, yet believing* addreſs themſelves to him. Beſides this Viſion appeared to St. *Stephen* on the finiſhing his Speech. They afterwards *ran upon him, and caſt him out of the City, and ſtoned him.* This muſt take up ſome Time: and we have no Reaſon to ſuppoſe that the Viſion continued to appear to him at this Diſtance of Time, and Place, or that his *Lord Jeſus* was in Sight, when he addreſſed his Petition to him. But St. *Stephen calls him the Son of Man.* And

ſo do all of us call him. [y] But this *Son of Man* was alſo *the Only-begotten Son of God, perfect God*, as well as *perfect Man*. No other *Son of Man* could hear, or grant, ſuch a Petition — *Lord Jeſus receive my Spirit* — Was this a Prayer to be addreſſed to a mere Man? It was a Prayer, that none was able to grant, but *the God of the Spirits of all Fleſh*. It is the ſame Prayer, which our *Lord* himſelf made to his *Father*, when, now expiring on the Croſs, [z] *he cried with a loud Voice, Father into thy Hands I commend my Spirit*.— And what adds great Confirmation to what is here ſaid, is that [a] it was cuſtomary for the *Chriſtian* Martyrs to direct their laſt Prayers perſonally to *Chriſt*, after the Example of St. *Stephen*.

[b] By the ſame Evaſion our *Apologiſt* would explain away another Paſſage of *Scripture* where Worſhip is offered to our *Bleſſed Saviour* in the fifth Chapter of the *Revelations*. But did he never read the whole Chapter? How then came he to paſs by v. 8, where we read that *the four Beaſts, and the four and twenty Elders, fell down before the Lamb*,

[y] *Joh.* iii. 14—16. [z] *Luk.* xxiii. 46.
[a] *Bingham.* Antiq. B. xiii. Ch. 2. S. 3. [b] P. 130.

having

having every one of them Harps, and golden Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of Saints. Here we ſee both Worſhip, and Prayer, offered to the *Lamb, the Prayers* of all *the Saints*—And at v. 13. the ſame Worſhip is offered indiſcriminately, both unto *him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb,* by all the *Angels and every Creature, which is in Heaven, and on the Earth—Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever: — And the four Beaſts ſaid Amen.* —— But *this* our Author tells us *is no more than a Declaration of their Reverence of him.* No. *If falling down before him,* offering him up *Prayers,* aſcribing to him *Honour* and *Glory* in the moſt ſolemn Manner, and jointly with *God Almighty,* is not *divine Worſhip,* it is not eaſy to ſay what is *divine Worſhip.* [c] This Viſion of St. *John* anſwers to the Appearance of *God* in the *Tabernacle,* and *Temple,* and is nearly the ſame, which appeared to the Prophets [d] *Iſaiah,* [e] *Ezekiel,* and [f] *Daniel. God* is repreſented as *ſitting on his Throne in Heaven. Chriſt* is repreſented under his Character of Mediator by the Figure of

[c] See my Sermon on *Joh.* xii. 41. [d] *Iſ.* vi. 1, &c.
[e] *Ezek.* i, &c. [f] *Dan.* vii. 9, &c.

a Lamb that was ſlain. His Exaltation under that Character is here repreſented, and the Homage and Worſhip paid him on that Occaſion by Men, and Angels. But it is obſervable that, though he ſtands in that Capacity diſtinguiſhed from him who ſat on the Throne, yet equal Worſhip is paid to both without any Diſtinction. And the like Titles, and Appellations are given to both. Is *he who ſat on the Throne* ſaid to live for ever and ever? [g] ſo our *Lord* ſaith of himſelf — *I am alive for evermore.* As *the four Beaſts* ſtyle *him who ſat on the Throne Lord God Almighty, which is, and which was, and which is to come* [h], ſo our *Lord* aſſumes to himſelf the ſame Titles. As we read that *there were ſeven Lamps of Fire burning before the Throne, which are the ſeven Spirits of God,* [i] ſo in the preceding Chapter we read that our *Lord* is ſtyled *he that hath the ſeven Spirits of God* [k]. Nay, *the Throne itſelf is called the Throne of God, and of the Lamb.*

[l] In the ſame Manner St. *Paul*, ſpeaking of our *Lord*, ſays, that *God had highly exalted*

[g] Ch. i. 18. [h] i. 8, 11, 17. See Dr. *Waterland*'s Sermon on *Joh.* xvi. 15. P. 217, &c. [i] iii. 1. [k] xxii. 1. [l] *Phil.* ii. 9, &c.

him,

him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name: that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth; and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is God, to the Glory of God the Father. This Text ſo expreſſive of the Homage, and Worſhip, paid to our *Lord* by all Creatures both *in Heaven, and Earth*, Mr. *Linſey* only barely refers to. I ſhall therefore content myſelf with referring him to Dr. *Waterland*'s excellent Sermon on this Text.

And that our *Lord* was to be *worſhipped* by *Angels*, as well as Men, appears from another remarkable Paſſage of *Scripture*, which our *Apologiſt* has wholly omitted. The Dignity of the *Son*, and his Superiority to the *Angels*, is aſſerted in very full and ſtrong Terms in the firſt and ſecond Chapter of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews [m]. He is ſaid to be *the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon.* He is expreſsly called *God*, ſaid to have *laid the Foundation of the Earth*, and created *the Heavens*; and to *uphold all Things by the Word of his Power.*

[m] *Heb.* i. 3, &c. See *Waterland*'s Sermons at Lady *Moyer*'s Lectures. P. 62, &c.—154, &c.

And

And *all the Angels of God* are called on to *worſhip him.* Afterwards we read——*thou madeſt him a little lower than the Angels*—or, as the Words may better be rendered—[n] *for a little Time lower than the Angels.*—*The Son of God* therefore was before his *Incarnation* ſuperior to all *Angels,* and conſequently no *Angel:* but was *God,* and *worſhipped by all the Angels.* And if the *Angels* were bound to *worſhip* him, much more we, who bear a nearer Relation to him, he being our Redeemer, as well as our Creator.

The Apoſtles in their Epiſtles have not given us any particular Forms of Prayer, nor have we perhaps any direct Invocations of *Chriſt* in them: and nothing leſs it ſeems will ſatisfy Mr. *Linſey.* But we have full Proof that the *Chriſtians* in thoſe Days did worſhip *Chriſt. Chriſtians* are deſcribed by the Title of *thoſe who call on the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* 1 Cor. i. 2. [o] But our *Apologiſt* has found out another way of tranſlating this Term. He renders it, *all them that are called by the Name of our Jeſus Chriſt*—and he has luckily the Authority of an able Commenta-

[n] Βραχύ τι. See *Grotius, Hammond.* [o] P. 133.

tor,

tor, Dr. *Hammond*, to ſupport him. But he might have known that this Interpretation of the Text is fully confuted by Dr. *Whitby* in his Annotations. One need indeed only turn to the Texts cited by Dr. *Hammond*. The Word ἐπικαλέμενος by itſelf indeed ſignifies *called*, or *named*. And out of five Texts which the Doctor has produced, four prove no more, as *Matt.* x. 3.—*Luk.* xxii. 3.—*Acts* i. 23.—iv. 36.—And the fifth—*Acts* vii. 59.—proves directly againſt him. The Word—ἐπικαλέμενον is there plainly uſed not in the *Paſſive*, but the *Middle Voice*, and ſignifies actively, *calling upon*, or *invoking:* and is by Dr. *Hammond* himſelf rendered—*He continued in Prayer to God.* And our *Apologiſt*, though he would expunge the Word *God*, yet allows it to be a *Prayer*, or *Invocation*. But the ſame Verb ἐπικαλέομαι—with an *Accuſative* Caſe following it, ought, according to all the Rules of *Grammar*, to be conſtrued in an *Active* Senſe. Accordingly it always in *Scripture* ſignifies, either *calling upon in Prayer*, or *appealing to*, as a Witneſs, or Judge. The learned Doctor has ſucceeded very happily in interpreting the *New Teſtament*, by Compariſon with the *Old*, and with the *Septuagint* Tranſlation. I wiſh he had taken the ſame

Method

Method here. *To call upon the Lord,* or *upon the Name of the Lord,* is a common Phraſe uſed in the *Old Teſtament* to ſignify *the Worſhip of God:* and is expreſſed in the *Septuagint* by the Verb—ἐπικαλέομαι—in the *Middle Voice.* Thus we read, *Gen.* xii. 8. *that Abraham built an Altar unto the Lord, and called upon the Name of the Lord* — ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίε — and ſo again — xiii. 4. and xxi. 33. — where it is expreſſed — ἐπεκαλεσατο το ονομα Κυριε — *Iſaac alſo built an Altar, and called upon the Name of the Lord,* as we read, *Gen.* xxvi. 25. where again it is tranſlated — ἐπεκαλεσατο τὸ ονομα Κυρίε —[p] The ſame Phraſe of *calling upon the Name of the Lord* is uſed in the ſame Senſe in many other Places. Επικαλέισθαι τὸν Κύριον, or τὸν Θεὸν is alſo uſed in many Places in an *Active* Senſe to ſignify the *Worſhip of God.* The like Phraſe is uſed in the ſame Senſe in many Places of the *New Teſtament,* and particularly in thoſe, on which the Doctor would put another Interpretation: and ſo he himſelf in his Paraphraſe acknowledges. We have already ſeen this in *Acts* vii. 59. Again [n] St. *Peter* quotes the Pro-

[p] 1 *Kings* xviii. 24 — 1 *Chron.* xvi. 8.—*Pſal.* lxxix. 6.--lxxx. 18.--xcix. 6.--cv. 1.--cxvi. 4. 17. — *Iſ.* lxiv. 7. —*Jer.* x. 24. —*Lam.* iii. 54.—*Joel.* ii. 32.—*Zech.* xiii. 9. [n] *Acts* ii. 21.

phecy

phecy of [r] *Joel*, and applies it to the Times of the *Goſpel*——Πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται — *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the Name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved.*—In the Prophet the Phraſe plainly ſignifies (as it does in all other places of the *Old Teſtament*) *the Worſhip of God:* and therefore muſt ſignify the ſame in the Citation. The ſame Prophecy is alſo cited by St. *Paul*, *Rom.* x. 13. another Text produced by Dr. *H.* which proves directly againſt him. For St. *Paul* applies this particularly to *Chriſt.* He was before ſpeaking of *Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, v. 9, &c. and then adds, v. 12. *The ſame Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* Then follows this Quotation from *Joel.* And in the next Verſe the Apoſtle adds—*How ſhall they call on him, in whom they have not believed?*——The *Apoſtle* is here ſpeaking of *Chriſt.* To *call upon him* is therefore ſomething different from, and ſubſequent to, *believing in him*; and can ſcarce ſignify any thing elſe but *worſhipping him.* And Dr. *H.* renders it—they ſhall *conſtantly confeſs, pray, and adhere to Chriſt.* There cannot indeed well be a fuller Proof of the *Divinity of*

[r] *Joel.* ii. 32.

Chriſt, and the *Worſhip* due to him, than this Paſſage. The Prophecy of *Joel* is here applied to *Chriſt*. He therefore is *Jehovah*: and it is our Duty to *call upon his Name*, and worſhip him. And he is here ſaid to be *Lord over all, rich unto all that call upon him*: ready to hear, and to grant the Prayers of all his faithful Servants. There is one more Text produced by Dr. *H.* where he would interpret the Word in a Paſſive Signification, *viz. Acts* ix. 14. where *Ananias* ſays to the *Lord*, who appeared to him,—*Here he (Saul) hath Authority from the Chief Prieſts to bind all that call on thy Name* — τὰς ἐπικαλεμένους τὸ ὄνομάσε—But the Doctor himſelf renders this Paſſage — *all that publickly avow the Worſhip of Chriſt*.—And he refers to the ſame Phraſe, *Acts* xxii. 16. where he paraphraſes it—*joining with the Church in Performance of all Chriſtian Duties of Devotion to God.* It cannot here, nor at v. 21. ſignify *thoſe who were called by the Name of Chriſt*: [t] for *the Diſciples* were not *called Chriſtians* till ſome Time after at *Antioch*. And for the ſame Reaſon in the laſt-cited Text, *Acts* xxi. 16. where *Ananias* bids *Saul ariſe and be baptized, and*

[t] *Acts* xi. 26.

waſh

waſh away his Sins, calling on the Name of the Lord — ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίε — muſt ſignify in an *Active* Senſe——*worſhipping the Lord.* Again, [u] *they that call on the Lord out of a pure Heart,* is a Phraſe uſed by St. *Paul,* 2 *Tim.* ii. 22. where the Word cannot well bear a *Paſſive* Signification, or ſignify any thing elſe but *the Worſhip of the Lord* [w]. The ſame Verb alſo --- ἐπικαλέισθε --- is uſed by St. *Peter,* to ſignify the *Worſhip of God.* In ſome other Places, both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament, the Name of God* is ſaid to be *called on* Perſons, or Things devoted to his Service: but here the Phraſe is different. The Word — ὀνομα — is here a nominative Caſe prefixed to the *Verb.* But, where the *Verb* — ἐπικαλέομαι---is followed by an *Accuſative Caſe,* it always ſignifies to *invoke,* or *worſhip,* excepting only where it ſignifies to *appeal to.* I know that Dr. *Clarke* would conſtrue it, as ſignifying only *believing in Chriſt, and acknowledging him as our Saviour.* But, if we conſider that the Phraſe in the *Old Teſtament* always ſignifies *the Worſhip of God,* and that in ſome of the Texts cited, as *Acts* ii. 21. — xxii. 16.—*Rom.* x. 12, 13.—2 *Tim.* ii. 22. —

[u] 2 *Tim.* ii. 22. [w] 1 *Pet.* i. 17.

it cannot well bear any other Senſe, then we have the greateſt Reaſon to interpret this Text of 1 Cor. i. 2. in the ſame Senſe. And if ſo, we have not only one, but many Texts of *Scripture*, to ſhew that it was the Practice of *Chriſtians*, in the Days of the Apoſtles, to *call upon the Name of Chriſt, and worſhip him*; and that this was the diſtinguiſhing Character, and Denomination, of *Chriſtians*. --- And what adds ſtill farther Confirmation to our Interpretation of this Text is, that in the Verſe immediately following St. *Paul* implores *Grace* to the Diſciples, *and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. And not only here in this Epiſtle, but in every one of his Epiſtles he begins with this, or the like, Benediction. And he concludes his ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* with this ſolemn Bleſſing---*The Grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt, be with you all. Amen.*---[x] St. *John* alſo uſes the like Form. [y] Our *Apologiſt* may call theſe *pious Wiſhes:* but I muſt beg leave to call them ſolemn Benedictions. That St. *Paul* ſhould ſo conſtantly join *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*

[x] 2 *Joh.* 3. [y] P. 132.

ſo

ſo cloſely with *God the Father*, and implore *Grace*, *Mercy*, and *Peace*, not only by him, but *from him*, ſeems to me to carry a ſtrong Proof that he was the Author of *Grace* and *Peace*; and that *from him Chriſtians* might, and ought, to aſk theſe Bleſſings. But to this our Author objects, that *Rev.* i. 4. St. *John* prays for *Grace* and *Peace*, not only *from God the Father, and Jeſus Chriſt*, but *from the ſeven Spirits which are before God's Throne*. But ſurely the Evidence ariſing from ſuch ſolemn Benedictions, ſo frequently repeated, cannot be ſet aſide by one obſcure Paſſage in the *Revelations*. It is much queſtioned what is to be underſtood by theſe *ſeven Spirits*. [z] Dr. *Lightfoot*, and other learned Men, are of Opinion, that the *Holy Ghoſt* himſelf is here meant, who is called ſo in reſpect of his manifold Gifts, and Operations. *Grotius* thinks that *Grace, and Peace*, are here prayed for from *God*, operating by *ſeven*, or many, different Ways [a]. The learned Mr. *Mede* ſuppoſes theſe *ſeven Spirits* to be the *ſeven Archangels*, who more immediately attend *the Throne of God*. Dr. *Hammond* alſo gives the like Interpretation. If our *Apolo-*

[z] Vol. I. P. 341. See alſo *Poole's Synops.*

[a] Diſc. x. P. 40, &c.

giſt

giſt is of the ſame Opinion, yet let him remember that our *Lord* himſelf ſtyles himſelf---*he that hath the ſeven Spirits of God*---[b] and *the Lamb* is deſcribed as *having ſeven Eyes, which are the ſeven Spirits of God:* and then let him conſider who muſt he be who hath Power over the higheſt Angels.

The ſame Interpretation our *Apologiſt* puts upon 1 *Theſſ.* iii. 11. and 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 16. Theſe are only *pious Wiſhes.* But are not theſe ſpiritual Bleſſings, which are here implored? and is not *God* the ſole Author of ſuch Bleſſings? Who can *direct our Way, make us to increaſe, and abound in Love, and ſtabliſh our Hearts unblameable in Holineſs,* but *God* alone? Who can *give us everlaſting Conſolation and good Hope through Grace? who can comfort our Hearts, and ſtabliſh us in every good Word, and Work,* but *God* alone? And are not theſe Bleſſings equally implored of *God our Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt?* and are not they joined together in cloſe Conjunction, as equally the Authors of theſe Bleſſings.

[b] *Rev.* iii. 1. [c] V. 6.

To

To these we must add (though our *Apologist* has not thought fit to take any Notice of them) Forms of *Adjuration*, or *calling Christ, and the Holy Ghost, to witness* to the Truth of what is said. [d] This has been always esteemed an Act of religious Worship, and an Acknowledgement of the *Divinity* of the Person thus *adjured*. Thus saith St. *Paul*——[e] *I say the Truth in Christ, I lie not, my Conscience also bearing me Witness in the Holy Ghost.* --- This Text Dr. *Whitby* thus paraphrases --- *I call Christ and the Holy Ghost to bear Witness with my own Conscience that I only speak the Truth* --- And his Note upon it is --- *An Oath being an Act of religious Worship, in which God is called upon as Witness to the Truth, or an Avenger of the Falsehood, of what we testify, or promise, by swearing by our Lord Christ, and the Holy Ghost, the Apostle must perform an Act of religious Worship to them, and by that agnise their Divinity—And by calling to them to bear Witness to the Secrets of his Heart, and Conscience, he must ascribe to them the Knowledge of the Secrets of the Heart of Man, which is the Property of God alone.*---And so also Dr. *Ham-*

[d] *Sanderson* de Juram. oblig. Prelect, I. Sect. 3 & 4.

[e] *Rom.* ix. 1.

mond

mond paraphraſes it---*I proteſt before Chriſt, and teſtify to you that Truth, of which mine own Conſcience, in the Preſence of the Holy Ghoſt, (that is privy to, and Searcher of Hearts) is Witneſs to me.*---To the ſame Purpoſe *Eraſmus* ---*Quod res eſt loquar, teſte Chriſto omnium conſcio, neque quicquam mentiar, teſte mihi meâ conſcientia, cujus autor et inſpector eſt Spiritus Sanctus* --- *Grotius* alſo interprets it to be *an Oath by Chriſt:* [f] and ſo do the Commentators in general. In like Manner St. *Paul* calls *Chriſt* to witneſs 2 Cor. xii. 19: ---*We ſpeak before God in Chriſt.*---And again, 1 Tim. ii. 17.---*I ſpeak the Truth in Chriſt, and lie not.* [g] Dr. *Clarke* interprets this ---*We ſpeak in the Preſence of God, Chriſt being our Witneſs.*

But farther, we have, I think, 2 *Cor.* xii. 8. an Inſtance of the Apoſtle's direct Invocation of *Chriſt* in Prayer---*For this Thing* (ſays St. *Paul) I beſought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me.*---[h] Here our *Apologiſt* tells us poſitively that St. *Paul appears here to have directed his Prayer to God the Father:* but how it ſo *appears* he tells us not. Dr. *Clarke*

[f] See *Poole*'s Synopſis.

[g] Script. Doct. Trin. N°. 698, 707, 735, 167.

[h] Page 132.

is

is more modeſt. He ſays that *the Word is ambiguous, ſignifying either Chriſt, or God the Father.* But he allows that *it ſeems from the following Verſes rather to be underſtood in this Place of Chriſt.* I humbly think it more than ſeems ſo. For in the next Verſe we read thus — that *the Lord ſaid unto me, My Grace is ſufficient for thee: for my Strength* — ἡ δύναμις μου — is made *perfect in Weakneſs.* And then it follows — *Moſt gladly therefore will I rather glory in my Infirmities, that the Strength* — ἡ δύναμις — *of Chriſt may reſt upon me.* It was then *the Power of Chriſt,* that *was made perfect in his Weakneſs.* And therefore it was *Chriſt,* to whom he prayed, and who anſwered his Prayer [i].

[k] But our *Apologiſt* would form an Argument againſt our *Lord's Divinity* from his being *a Mediator between God and Man.* I ſhould draw juſt the contrary Inference. [l] *He is now paſſed into the Heavens:* and if we cannot apply to him there, how can he be our *Mediator?* How can we *have an Acceſs to the Father by him,* if we can have no *Acceſs* to him himſelf? [m] *He ever liveth to make In-*

[i] See *Grotius, Whitby* Annot. *Poole's* Synopſis.
[k] P. 26. [l] *Heb.* iv. 14. [m] vii. 25, &c.

terceſſion for us: but how ſhall he *intercede for us*, if he can neither hear our Prayers, nor be ſenſible of our Wants? The *Jewiſh High Prieſts* could not *continue by Reaſon of Death:* but *the Son* is *conſecrated for evermore.* [n] *He is entered into Heaven*, and *appears in the Preſence of God for us*, and offers up our Prayers to him there. As our *Mediator*, and *High-Prieſt*, he is a diſtinct Perſon from *God the Father*. But he is *the Son of God, God of God.* And as ſuch [o] he *is a Diſcerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart:* and *all Things are naked, and opened to his Eyes.* As *Man* he was ſubject to the Infirmities of human Nature: and as *God*, he knows all our Wants, and Infirmities. [p] And therefore we are encouraged to *come boldly unto the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain Mercy, and find Grace to help in Time of Need.*

But there is another Species of Worſhip beſides that of Invocation. [q] We find in the Book of *Revelations* all Creatures *worſhipping him that liveth for ever and ever, by giving Glory, Honour, and Thanks to him.* For *Worſhip* is paid to *God*, and his *divine* Perfections

[n] *Heb.* ix, 24. [o] iv. 12, 13. [p] v. 16.
[q] *Rev.* iv. 9, 10.

acknowledged,

acknowledged, as much by giving Praiſe, and Glory, to him, as by offering him Prayers, and Supplications. And accordingly *Doxologies* have had a Place in all *Liturgies:* and been generally put at the Concluſion of Hymns, and Prayers. The Apoſtles probably eſtabliſhed Forms of Worſhip in every Church: but we have none delivered down to us in *Scripture.* We have *Doxologies:* but they run in different Forms: and ſo I ſuppoſe they did in the antient *Liturgies.* We have already had Occaſion to take Notice of a very full one *Rev.* v. 13, where we find the whole Creation joining in giving *Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.* And ſo again Chap. vii. 9. we are told that *a great Multitude of all Nations cried with a loud Voice, ſaying, Salvation to our God which ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb.* — St. *Paul* in his Epiſtles uſes different Forms of giving *Glory to God.* [r] Sometimes he gives *Glory to God in general,* [s] ſometimes to the *Father* in particular, [t] ſometimes to the *Father through the Son.* [u] In other Places it is uncertain whether the *Father* is

[r] *Rom.* xi. 36. — 2 *Tim.* iv. 18. [s] 1 *Phil.* iv. 20.
[t] *Rom.* xvi. 7. — *Eph.* i. 21. [u] *Gal.* i. 3.

ſpoken of, or the *Son*. But in ſome Places *Glory* is given to the *Son* only. Thus *Heb.* xiii. 20, 21. — *The God of Peace make you perfect in every good Work to do his Will, working in you that which is well-pleaſing in his Sight through Jeſus Chriſt, to whom be Glory for ever and ever, Amen.* —— Theſe laſt words muſt in all reaſonable Conſtruction be referred to the immediate Antecedent — *Jeſus Chriſt.* — St. *Peter* is ſtill more plain — [w] *Grow in Grace, and in the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. To him be Glory both now, and for ever, Amen.* — And ſo alſo *Rev.* i. 5, 6. we have this *Doxology* — *Unto him that loved us, and waſhed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God, and his Father, to him be Glory, and Dominion, now and for ever. Amen.* — But here we are told that *there are ſo many different Readings of this Paſſage, that no certain Concluſions can be drawn from it.* — I have looked into Dr. *Mill's New Teſtament*, and can find no various Readings that much alter the Senſe, excepting one, and that is only in one MS. which reads — τῦ ἀγαπήσαντος καὶ λέσαντος — And even according to this Reading the *Doxology* more

[w] 2 *Pet.* iii. 18. It ought not however to be concealed that ſome MSS. add here — καὶ Θεῦ Πάτρος.

properly

properly belongs to *Chriſt* the Perſon ſpoken of before, and alſo in the Words immediately following — *Behold he cometh with Clouds*, &c. — The *Doxology* alſo 2 *Tim.* iv. 18. according to Dr. *Clarke*, ſeems rather to be meant of *Chriſt*. And ſo, I think, is that which we have *Jud.* 25. But theſe I paſs by as ambiguous.

[x] If we enquire into the *Doxologies* uſed in the ancient Church, we ſhall find them different in Form: but all, or moſt of them, addreſſed to the *Son*, and to the *Holy Ghoſt*, as well as the *Father*. The moſt ancient Form ran — *To the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt.* — [y] *Clemens* Biſhop of *Rome*, [z] St. *Paul's Fellow-labourer*, thus expreſſes himſelf — *We who fly to his (God's) Mercies through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, to whom be Glory, and Majeſty throughout all Ages.* —— The antient Account we have of the Martyrdom of *Ignatius* concludes thus — *Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, by whom, and with whom, be Glory and Dominion to the Father, with the Holy Ghoſt for ever, Amen.* In like manner con-

[x] See *Bingham.* Antiq. L. xiv. Ch. 2. S. 1.
[y] Epiſt. i. ad *Corinth.* S. 20. [z] *Phil.* iv. 3.

cludes

cludes [a] the Epiſtle of the *Church of Smyrna* concerning the Martyrdom of St. *Polycarp* — *Jeſus Chriſt, to whom be Glory, with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, throughout all Ages.* — And in the ſame Epiſtle we have a Prayer, which *Polycarp* offered up to *God* at his Martyrdom, which concludes thus —— *I praiſe, and glorify thee, with the eternal and heavenly Jeſus Chriſt, thy beloved Son, with whom to thee, and the Holy Ghoſt, be Glory both now, and for evermore. Amen.* — In the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, which (though we do not, with Mr. *Whiſton*, ſuppoſe them to be written by the *Apoſtles*, nor by St. *Clement* of *Rome*) [b] are by the beſt Criticks ſuppoſed to contain the antient Offices of the Church, we find ſeveral *Doxologies*. In the 8th Book Ch. 12. the *Oblation Prayer* concludes thus — *To thee be all Glory, Worſhip, Thankſgiving, Honour, and Adoration, to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt, both now, and for ever, and to infinite, and endleſs Ages, and let all the People ſay Amen.* — In the 13 Chapter of the ſame Book the *Prayer for the faithful* is thus concluded—*by thy Chriſt, with whom be Glory,*

[a] This Epiſtle is quoted, and no ſmall Part of it recited by *Euſebius* Hiſt. Eccleſ. L. iv. Ch. 15. [b] *Cave, Du Pin, Beveridge, Bingham* Antiq. B. xiii. Ch. 5. Sect. 7.

Honour,

Honour, Praiſe, Doxology, and Thankſgiving to thee, and the Holy Ghoſt, for ever. Amen. — In the 15th Chapter the *Invocation after the Communion* ends thus — *To thee be Glory, Praiſe, Majeſty, Worſhip, and Adoration, and to thy Son Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord, and God, and King, and to the Holy Ghoſt now and for ever. Amen.* —— And moſt of the Prayers there are concluded with the like *Doxologies.* Again, *Clemens* of *Alexandria* thus concludes his laſt Book of his *Pedagogue* — *Let us give Thanks to the only Father and Son, to the Son our Pedagogue and Teacher, with the Holy Spirit, one in all Reſpects, in whom are all Things, by whom all Things are one, by whom is Eternity, whoſe Members we all are, whoſe is the Glory, who is in all Things good, fair, wiſe, and juſt, to whom be Glory now, and for ever. Amen.* — There follows an *Hymn to Chriſt.* [c] But, when the *Arian* Controverſy aroſe, thoſe of that Perſuaſion would uſe no other Form of *Doxology* but — *Glory be to the Father, by the Son, and by the Holy Ghoſt* — [d] St. *Baſil* in his Treatiſe on the *Holy Ghoſt* proves at large that though this Form was ſometimes uſed, and was very proper, when

[c] *Bingham.* Antiq. B. xiv. Ch. 2. Sect. 1. *Berriman* on Primitive Doxol. [d] Cap. vii, xxv & xxix,

rightly

rightly underſtood, yet the other was more common, and uſed by all the antient Churches. [e] What Reaſon then has our *Apologiſt* to quarrel with the Form of *Doxology* uſed in our Church? and what Occaſion has he to fall upon Arch-Bp *Secker*, who has given him no Provocation. The Arch-Bp in the Place cited ſays not a Word in behalf of our Form of *Doxology:* he pleads only for the repeating our Praiſes to *God* often; and to that End very properly introduces *Eph.* v. 20, where the Apoſtle exhorts us to *give Thanks always for all Things to God and the Father in the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* But what Authority our Author has to add the Word — *only* — to the Text, or how he would infer from hence that no *Thanks* are to be given to the *Son*, or the *Holy Ghoſt*, I know not. Theſe *tacit Condemnations* and negative Arguments, I cannot comprehend the Force of. [f] As to the latter Clauſe of our *Doxology* — *As it was in the Beginning* &c. it was not ſo ſoon introduced, nor is it certainly known when, or where, or on what Occaſion it was firſt uſed: it appears however to have been at leaſt 1200 Years old. But [g] Our *Apologiſt* makes it ſtill

[e] P. 117. [f] See *Bingham* as above. [g] P. 118.

older,

older, and falls foul upon St. *Jerom* for *compoſing it:* and tells us that it *had an unchriſtian, and uncharitable, Origin.* But he ſhould have known that theſe Epiſtles between Pope *Damaſus* and *Jerom* are rejected as ſpurious by all learned Men. And, if it be *unchriſtian, and uncharitable,* to exclude *crafty Hereticks* from our Communion, who hold *the Son of God* to be a Creature, I am afraid the Charge will lie not only againſt thoſe who added this Clauſe, but againſt the *Council of Nice,* all the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, and St. *John* himſelf. Nor can I find what Right, or Reaſon, he has to find fault with this Clauſe. It is compoſed in the very Words of *Scripture.* —[i] *In the Beginning was the Word,* (ſaith St. *John*) *and the Word was God.* And therefore moſt certainly *in the Beginning Glory* was given to him. [k] Nay he himſelf hath told us that he *had Glory with the Father before the World was.* [l] And the ſame St. *John* has repreſented the whole Creation as giving *Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.* Nay, he himſelf owns it to be reaſonable [m] *to declare our Reverence, and high Eſteem of him, and on all proper Occaſions to join*

[h] See *Bingham* as above. [i] *Joh.* i. 1. [k] *Joh.* xvii. 5. [l] *Rev.* v. 13. [m] P. 131.

with his Apoſtle in ſaying — To him be Glory both now and for ever. — Why does he then refuſe to declare this? — Why does he ſtrike out of the *Liturgy* almoſt every Clauſe that gives *Glory* to his *Saviour?* Why does he expunge this *Doxology*, which he might explain to his own Senſe much more eaſily, than he can the firſt Verſe of St. *John*'s Goſpel, and many other Parts of *Scripture?* [n] But we are told that it matters not much to inquire when this Doxology *was firſt uſed, or how long it had been uſed, if it is not in the New Teſtament.* —— I know of no Form of Prayer enjoined *in the New Teſtament*, but only the *Lord's Prayer:* and therefore according to this Rule we ought to uſe no other. But it has been ſhewn that in the *New Teſtament Glory, and Praiſe*, are offered up to our *Bleſſed Saviour.* And, if in ſome of theſe Places there be ſome Ambiguity, what better Method can we take of clearing up theſe Ambiguities than by enquiring into the Practice of the antient Church? This at leaſt appears from the Examples produced that the firſt *Chriſtians* worſhipped *Chriſt*, and offered up their *Doxologies*, and gave *Glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.*

[n] P. 118.

And

[o] And yet our *Apologiſt* has the Aſſurance to tell us that all Chriſtian People for upwards of 300 Years *after Chriſt, till the Council of Nice, were generally Unitarians, what is now called either Arian, or Socinian.*— [p] And in another Place he is pleaſed to tell us that *it was the univerſal Practice of the Chriſtian Church, with little or no Variation, for the three firſt Centuries, to addreſs all religious Worſhip only to God the Father.* —— But herein he contradicts, not only all Hiſtory, but himſelf too. [q] For he ſays that *Irenæus, and Juſtin Martyr*, two Writers of the ſecond Century, *contributed to bring into Chriſtianity the Platonick Doctrine of a ſecond God:* [r] and that *the Word Trinity was firſt uſed by Theophilus*, who wrote in the ſame Century. But what Proof does he bring of theſe confident Aſſertions? none from any of the Works of the moſt antient Writers. But he appeals to the antient *Creeds*, and to Dr. *Whitby*, who, if, you will believe him, *has confuted the Objections of Bull, and Waterland, with accumulated Evidence.* It has been already, I truſt, fully ſhewn that all the Remains we have of ancient *Creeds* prove the

[o] P. 24. [p] P. 147, 8. [q] P. 158. [r] P. 12.

direct contrary of what our Author here alledges them for. As to Dr. *Whitby* he was in the Vigour of his Age a zealous Assertor of the Doctrine of the *Trinity:* and in his Annotations has vindicated several Texts of *Scripture* from the Misconstructions of *Socinus.* Some of his Comments I have had Occasion to refer to. He lived to a great Age: and in his latter Days, when Dr. *Clarke* wrote his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, he sided with him, and wrote a Treatise entitled —— *Disquisitiones modestæ in Bulli defensionem Fidei Nicenæ*, —— wherein he passes Censure on a Book, [s] which he had before in a Treatise on *Christ's Divinity* cried up as a most excellent Performance. Dr. *Whitby* was a Man of Learning, and had done good Service to the Church, and to the learned World. But we must appeal from Dr. *Whitby* in his Dotage to Dr. *Whitby* in his sober Senses. As to this Treatise of his, I have it not, nor have I been able to obtain a Sight of it. I believe it is out of Print, and long ago buried in Oblivion. But this I find, that it has been fully answered by [t] Dr. *Waterland* in his First Defence of his

[s] Opus ære perennius ad doctorum invidiam, et novatorum cordolium summo judicio et industriâ peregit. P. 59.

[t] Q. xxvi. P. 399, &c.

Queries

Queries. The Dr. has therein fully expoſed his notorious Fallacies, Miſconſtructions, and falſe Quotations, as any one may ſee, who will take the Pains to look into that Treatiſe. The Dr. thus concludes his Remarks — *You may perceive by this Time that Bp Bull's Book is like to ſtand, till ſomething much more conſiderable appears againſt it. Several Attempts of this Kind have been made before: but to as little Purpoſe. And if there be ever ſo many more, by ever ſo good Hands, I'll venture to ſay, they will ſucceed no better. The Book will ſtand as long as clear Senſe, ſound Reaſoning, and true Learning have any Friends left. The main Subſtance of it is not to be confuted, any more than you can extinguiſh Truth, or put out the Light of the Sun.* I think that Dr. *Whitby* made ſome Reply to this: but whatever he had to ſay has been fully anſwered by Dr. *Waterland.* When our *Apologiſt* then will produce this *accumulated Evidence*, it will be then Time enough to conſider it. But by what I have ſeen of it in the Treatiſe above-cited, it ſeems to deſerve very little Notice. — [u] But our *Apogiſt* refers us to *Dr. Clarke's Obſervations on Dr. Waterland's ſecond Defence of his Queries*,

[u] Page 66.

which,

which, it ſeems, fully confuted Dr. *Waterland, and cloſed* the Controverſy. But he is much miſtaken. Theſe *Obſervations* were not, I think, Dr. *Clarke*'s, but Mr. *Jackſon*'s, and were fully anſwered by Dr. *Waterland* in a Pamphlet entitled, *A farther Vindication of Chriſt's Divinity* —to which I do not find that the Author made any Reply.

But we need not rely on the Authority of Dr. *Whitby*, Dr. *Waterland*, or Bp *Bull*. We have the Works of the *Primitive Fathers* before us. [w] It has been already ſhewn that they held that it was the *Son of God*, who appeared to the *Patriarchs*, and was worſhipped by them, and they from thence infer his *Divinity*. We have ſeen alſo that they looked on the *Form of Baptiſm* as a Profeſſion of their Belief in the *Trinity*; that their antient *Creeds* teach the ſame Doctrine, and that their *Doxologies* were addreſſed in the moſt ſolemn Manner to the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, as well as to the *Father*. But for the farther Information of *the leſs learned*, the Rev. Mr. *Lindſey* himſelf amongſt the reſt, I ſhall add a few more Proofs from ſome of the moſt early

[w] Page 11, &c.

Writers.

Writers. [x] *Clemens* Bp of *Rome* thus begins his ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* — *Brethren, We ought to think of Jeſus Chriſt, as of God, as of the Judge of quick, and dead, nor ought we to think meanly of our Salvation.* — *Ignatius* addreſſes the Church of *Epheſus as elected by the Will of the Father, and Jeſus Chriſt our God:* [y] and in other Parts of the ſame Epiſtle he calls *Chriſt our God.* In the Preface of his Epiſtle to the *Romans, Chriſt* is twice called *our God.* And in the ſame Epiſtle S. 4. he deſires the Brethren to *pray unto Chriſt for him.* He thus begins his Epiſtle to the Church of *Smyrna* —— *I glorifie Jeſus Chriſt our God, who hath given us ſuch Wiſdom.* — And thus he cloſes his Epiſtle to *Polycarp* —— *I wiſh you all Happineſs in our God Jeſus Chriſt, in whom continue in the Unity, and Protection of God.* [z] And the antient Relation of this Saint's Martyrdom informs us that juſt before his Death *he prayed to the Son of God for the Churches.* — *Polycarp* in his Epiſtle to the *Philippians* prays that *the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and he himſelf the eternal High Prieſt, the Son of God, even Jeſus Chriſt,*

x The Genuineneſs of this Epiſtle has been ſufficiently vindicated by Bp *Bull*, Dr. *Cave*, and others. The Genuineneſs alſo of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles has been vindicated by Biſhop *Pearſon*, and others. y S. 4, 15. S. 6. z S. 12.

World

would build them in Faith, and in Truth, &c. This is not only a *pious Wiſh,* but a Prayer to the *Son* jointly with the *Father,* and repreſents him, as well as the *Father,* as the Giver of all good Gifts. And the Epiſtle of the Church of *Smyrna,* which gives us an Account of the Martyrdom of this good Man, tells us that his Perſecutors, *at the Inſtigation of the Jews, took care that no Remainder of his Body ſhould be left, leſt the Chriſtians, forſaking him that was crucified, ſhould begin to worſhip this Polycarp; not knowing* (ſay they) *that we can never forſake Chriſt* —— *nor worſhip any other.* — *For him indeed, as being the Son of God, we worſhip. But the Martyrs we worthily love, as the Diſciples and Imitators of the Lord.* — [b] *This,* as the learned Mr. *Bingham* obſerves, *is an unanſwerable Teſtimony, to prove both the divine Worſhip of Chriſt, as the true Son of God, and that no Martyr or other Saint was worſhipped in thoſe Days.*

Not long after lived *Juſtin Martyr.* [c] We have already ſeen that he held *Chriſt* to be the Perſon, who appeared to *Abraham,* and the *Patriarchs,* whom *Moſes,* and the *Children of Iſrael* worſhipped, and whom all the *Angels*

[a] S. 17. [b] Antiq. B. xiii. Cap. 2. S. 2. [c] P. 11.

adored.

adored. [d] I have in my Vindication brought many Proofs of his Belief of our *Lord's Divinity*. I ſhall here content myſelf with citing a few, which bear Teſtimony to the *Worſhip of Chriſt*. [e] In his Dialogue with *Trypho*, after having brought ſeveral Proofs of the *Divinity* of our *Saviour* from the *Old Teſtament*, he adds — *Theſe Words plainly ſhew that he is the Object of Worſhip, both God, and Chriſt* —— [f] Again in the ſame Dialogue he thus beſpeaks *Trypho* — *Do you think that there is any other ſaid in Scripture to be the Object of Worſhip, Lord, and God, but he who made the Univerſe, and Chriſt, who is proved by ſo many Texts of Scripture to have been made Man?* — [g] Once more he ſays — *When David taught that he was begotten before the Sun and Moon, according to the Will of his Father, he ſhewed that Chriſt was the mighty God, and the Object of Worſhip.* — [h] But we are told that *theſe early Fathers contributed to bring into Chriſtianity the Platonick Doctrine of a Second God, which they had learnt before their Converſion to Faith.* [i] I know this has been ſaid by *Le Clerc*, and

[d] Pt. iii. p. 28, &c. [e] P. 287. [f] P. 293.
[g] P. 302. [h] P. 158. [i] See this Point accurately handled in a Diſſertation by a learned Friend of mine in my Vindic. Doct. Trin. Pt. iii. P. 50, &c.

others. But I never yet could see any sufficient Proof that *Plato*, or any of his Followers before *Christ*, held the Doctrine of *a Trinity in Unity*. Nor does it appear that *these Fathers* were all, or most of them, *Platonists*. *Justin* himself had, in Quest of Truth, applied to all the chief Sects of Philosophy, [k] as he himself tells us. Nor did they bring their philosophical Notions into *Christianity*. On the contrary they on all Occasions very severely censure these Philosophers. And *Justin*, though he speaks honourably of *Plato*, [l] yet very freely censures his absurd Notions of the *Deity*. But if *Justin*'s Authority may be questioned in Matters of Faith, yet surely he must be allowed to be a competent Witness of plain, and notorious, Matter of Fact. And he bears full Testimony that the *Christians* in his Days worshipped both the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*. [m] In his Second Apology, to wipe off the Charge of *Atheism* brought against the *Christians* by their Enemies, he answers that they could not be called *Atheists*, *who worshipped, and adored, God the Father, the Son,*

[k] Dial. *Tryph.* sub init. [l] Ad Græcos Cohort. P. 6, &c. 21. [m] P. 56. See this Passage quoted at large, and vindicated against all Exceptions, by Bp *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. Cap. 4. N. 8.

who came from him, and the prophetick Spirit. — [n] And in the ſame Apology in Anſwer to the ſame Charge he replies as before, that as *they worſhipped God the Creator of all Things*, ſo *they paid Honour to Jeſus Chriſt in the ſecond Place, knowing him to be the Son of God, and to the prophetick Spirit in the third Place.*

Athenagoras, a Writer nearly of the ſame Age, to the ſame Charge makes the ſame Anſwer — [o] *Who would not wonder* (ſays he) *to hear thoſe called Atheiſts, who call the Father God, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt God, ſhewing their Power in Unity, and their Diſtinction in Order.* — And again, [p] *We are not therefore Atheiſts, honouring as God the Maker of this Univerſe, and the Word, who proceeded from him.*

Nay, *Heathen* Authors alſo bear Witneſs to the Practice of the *Chriſtians* in thoſe Times. *Pliny*, who lived in the Beginning of the ſecond Century, [q] in an Epiſtle to the Emperor *Trajan* tells him that, having taken a Confeſſion of ſome *Chriſtians, they declared to him that they uſed to meet on a certain Day before*

[n] P. 60. [o] P. 11. [p] P. 34. [q] Lib. x. Ep. 97.

it was light, and ſing an Hymn to Chriſt, as to God. And *Lucian*, who lived in the ſame Century, in his *Philopatris* ridicules the *Chriſtians*, as ſwearing by the three Perſons in the *Trinity*. And again in his *Proteus* he charges the *Chriſtians* with *worſhipping a crucified Impoſtor*, as he blaſphemouſly terms our bleſſed *Lord*. [r] And we find that *Celſus* afterwards brought the ſame Charge againſt *Chriſtians*.

Irenæus, who flouriſhed about the middle of the ſecond Century, [s] tells us that *Chriſt with the Father is the God of the Living, who ſpake to Moſes, who appeared to the Patriarchs, and was worſhipped by the Prophets.* [t] The ſame Father ſpeaking of the Miracles then wrought by *Chriſtians*, and particularly in *caſting out Devils*, ſays that they *did it not by Invocations of Angels, or Inchantments, or other evil and curious Arts, but clearly and openly directing their Prayers unto the Lord who made all Things, and calling on the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

And that they called upon him by Prayer appears from *a Prayer for Perſons poſſeſſed* preſerved in the [v] *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*

[r] *Origen.* contra Celſ. L. iii. P. 131. Lib. iv. Cap. 11. [s] Contra Hæreſ. [t] Lib. ii. Cap. 57. [v] Lib. viii. C. 7.

addreſſed

addreſſed to *Chriſt*. It calls him among other honourable Appellations him *whom the Angels worſhip*, and concludes thus ——— *O only-begotten God, Son of the great Father, rebuke the evil Spirits, and deliver the Works of thy Hands from the Power of the ſtrange Spirit. For to thee is Glory, Honour, and Majeſty, and by thee to the Father, in the Holy Ghoſt, for ever, Amen.*

Towards the Cloſe of this Century lived *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, who bears full Teſtimony to the *Worſhip* of Chriſt. In his *Admonition to the Gentiles* he thus expreſſes [u] himſelf *Believe, O Man, in him who is both Man and God; believe, O Man, in him who ſuffered, and is worſhipped, the living God.* — [w] Again in his *Stromata* — *We are commanded to worſhip, and honour, him, whom we believe to be the Word, our Saviour, and by him the Father.* — I have already taken Notice of his *Doxologies* at the End of his *Pedagogue*. There is indeed there a direct Prayer addreſſed to the *Son* jointly with the Father in theſe Words — *Be merciful to thy Children, O Maſter, O Father, the Guide of Iſrael, Son, and Father, both One* — and the whole is concluded with an *Hymn to Chriſt*.

[u] P. 66. [w] Lib. vii. C. 7. P. 719.

About

About the ſame Time flouriſhed *Tertullian.* [x] We find that it was then a common Objecjection againſt *Chriſtians*, that *they worſhipped a Man condemned to Death by the Jews.* —— *Tertullian* does not anſwer this Charge by denying that they *worſhipped Chriſt*, but by juſtifying this *Worſhip*. *They knew him to be begotten of God, and therefore called the Son of God, and God, by Unity of Subſtance. For God was a Spirit — and the Son was Spirit of Spirit, and God of God, as Light is of Light — ſo what proceeds from God is God, and the Son of God, and both One* — [y] In his Treatiſe againſt the *Jews* he boaſts that *the Kingdom, and Name, of Chriſt is ſpread every where, is believed every where, he is worſhipped by all the Nations abovementioned, reigns, and is adored every where — is God and Lord to all.* [z] Again in his Treatiſe *ad Uxorem* he diſſuades *Chriſtian* Women from marrying *Unbelievers*, and uſes this Argument among others, that in ſuch a Family there could be *no Mention of God, no Invocation of Chriſt.* [a] Laſtly in his Book againſt *Praxeas*, who denied the Diſtinction of *Perſons* in the *Trinity*, he argues thus — *Therefore they pre-*

x Apol. Cap. xxi. y Cap. vii. z Lib. ii. Cap. 6. a Cap. 3.

tend

tend that we preach two, nay three, Gods, but they are the Worſhippers of one only God (and ſo alſo pretends Mr. *L.*) *as if the Unity abſurdly collected might not make an Hereſy, and the Trinity rationally underſtood might not conſtitute the Truth.* [b] And he there explains how theſe *Three* are *One* —— viz. *of one Subſtance, Condition, and Power.* — Nor have we here only *Tertullian*'s own private Opinion, but his full Teſtimony that the *Worſhip* of the *Trinity* was the Practice of the *Chriſtian Church* in his Days, and that their Enemies reproached them with it.

In the next Century lived *Novatian*, and, though he ſtands charged with ſome Errors and Miſdemeanors, yet his Teſtimony is of Force with regard to the Practice of the Church in his Time. We have extant of his a Treatiſe on the *Trinity*. [c] Among many other Arguments for the Divinity of *Chriſt* he uſes this — *If Chriſt is only a Man, how can he be preſent in all Places to thoſe who call upon him, ſince it is not the Nature of a Man, but of God, to be preſent in all Places?* And he argues farther, in direct Oppoſition to Mr. *L.*

[b] Cap. 2. [c] Cap. xiv.

— *If*

— *If Christ be only a Man, why do we call upon him as a Mediator, as the Invocation of a mere Man must be thought of no Efficacy to Salvation?*

Cotemporary with *Novatian* was *Cyprian*. Many Passages might be produced from him in Proof of our *Lord's Divinity:* I shall select only two or three relating to his *Worship*. In his eleventh Epistle he exhorts Men *to be instant in Prayer, and first to pray to our Lord, and then by him to God the Father*. Again, in his 61st Epistle he thus bespeaks *Lucius* — *In our Sacrifices, and our Prayers, we cease not to give Thanks to God the Father, and to his Son Christ our Lord, and to make Prayer, and Supplication, that he who is perfect, and makes us perfect, would keep and perfect in you the glorious Crown of your Confession*. Lastly, in his Treatise on the *Benefit of Patience* he tells us that *God the Father has commanded his Son to be worshipped, and the Apostle Paul, mindful of the divine Precept, says — God hath exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of Things in Heaven, and Things in Earth, and Things under the Earth*.

Arnobius,

Arnobius, another *Ante-Nicene* Writer, [d] in Anſwer to the *Heathens*, who objected to the *Chriſtians* that *they worſhipped a Man, who was put to Death on the Croſs, and contended that he was a God, and believed that he was ſtill alive, and worſhipped him with daily Supplications*, firſt retorts their own Objection upon them, [e] and then anſwers more cloſely, that *he not only might be called God on account of his Services to Mankind*, but that *he was truly and undoubtedly God, and therefore they could not deny that he was a proper Object of Worſhip*. And though an *angry Heathen* might *rave* at his being called *God, yet they muſt anſwer that he was God, and God too of the interior Powers of the Soul*. We have ſeen the ſame Objection anſwered in like manner by *Tertullian*, and ſo it is by *Minucius Felix, Origen*, and *Lactantius:* but their Evidence ſhall be conſidered hereafter.

We have farther Proof from *Euſebius*. [f] He has given us a Fragment from *Caius*, a Roman Preſbyter, who lived in the Beginning of the third Century. He informs us that there

[d] Lib. i. P. 30. [e] P. 36. [f] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. v. Cap. 28.

were in his Time *antient Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, in the Church *written by the Faithful*, [g] *praiſing Chriſt the Word of God, and attributing Divinity to him.*

The ſame *Euſebius* has given us an Epiſtle from the *Council of Antioch*, which cenſured *Paul of Samoſata* for denying the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, in which among other Things they charge him with *forbidding the Uſe of the Pſalms, which uſed to be ſung in Honour of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

We learn alſo from the ſame Writer, as we do alſo from others, that it was uſual for the Martyrs at their Death to invoke *Chriſt* after the Example of St. *Stephen*. [h] He informs us that *Blandina*, at her Martyrdom, *had familiar Converſe with Chriſt*; [i] that *ſeveral Chriſtians in Phrygia* ſuffered Martyrdom [j] *calling on Chriſt the God over all*; and laſtly, that [k] *Porphyrius* the Martyr expired in the Flames, *calling on Chriſt the Son of God to help him.* To this I may add *Euſebius*'s Teſtimony concerning his own Times. [l] He tells us that *the*

g τὸν Λογὸν τῦ Θεῦ ὑμνῦσι θεολογῦντες. h Lib. v. Cap. 1.
i L. viii. Cap. 11. j He refers, I preſume to Rom. ix. 5. k De Martyr. Palæſt. Cap. 11. l Eccl. Hiſtor. Lib. x. Cap. 4.

higheſt

higheſt Powers on Earth confeſſed Chriſt, not as a common King made of Men, but worſhipped him as the true Son of the Supreme God, and God himſelf.

Thus have I deduced the Proofs of the *Worſhip* of the *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, through all Ages from the Days of the Apoſtles down to the Time of the *Council of Nice*. And I think it fully appears how little Reaſon our *Apologiſt* has ſo confidently to aſſert that *religious Worſhip was in thoſe Days addreſſed to the Father only*. The *Heathens* conſtantly objected to them the *Worſhip* of a Man put to Death on the Croſs: from whence it is plain that it was their Practice to *worſhip Chriſt*. And this is the Reaſon that they principally inſiſt on *his Worſhip*. And, whereas our Author pretends that *the Holy Ghoſt* was never worſhipped till after the *Council of Nice*, the contrary is evident from the Quotations from *Juſtin Martyr*, *Lucian's Philopatris*, *Tertullian*, and other Places cited before with regard to the *Baptiſmal Form*, and antient *Doxologies*. And all this our *Apologiſt* might have learnt from [m] Mr. *Bingham*'s

[m] Antiq. B. xiii. Ch. 2.

Antiquities, and other Authors. I might have added Proofs from the ancient Liturgies, in all of which are Prayers to the *Son*, and to the *Holy Ghoſt*. [n] But as it does not appear when theſe Liturgies were committed to writing, and as it is probable that they have undergone Reviews, and received ſeveral Additions, ſince they were firſt compoſed; and as I have confined myſelf chiefly to ſuch Writers, as lived before the Council of *Nice*, I do not think proper to inſiſt on them, though it is probable that moſt of the Prayers therein contained are the Prayers of the antient Church.

But what has he to ſay in Oppoſition to this full Evidence? [o] We have (what is indeed very ſtrange) the Teſtimony of Bp *Bull*, that able *Defender of the Nicene Faith*. Two Paſſages of his are quoted from Dr. *Clarke*, to prove an Aſſertion directly contrary to what he has maintained moſt ſtrongly, and proved moſt inconteſtably, in ſeveral learned Treatiſes. In Oppoſition to the Bp of *Meaux*, who pleaded for the Invocation of Angels, he ſays that *in the firſt and beſt Ages the Churches of Chriſt directed all their Prayers to God only through*

[n] Ibid. Ch. v. S. 3. [o] P. 148, 9.

the

the Mediation of Jeſus Chriſt. And, again in his Sermon on *the Exiſtence of Angels* he ſays that *in the Clementine Liturgy* [p] *there is not one Prayer made either to Angel, or Saint: but all the Prayers are directed to God, in the Name of his Son Jeſus Chriſt, as they are in our Liturgy.* His Meaning is plain. His Deſign could not be to exclude the *Worſhip of Chriſt*, but only that of all Creatures, *Saints*, and *Angels.* The Bp well knew, and [q] has ſhewn, that in the *Clementine Liturgy* many of the *Doxologies* are offered up jointly to *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, as they are in our *Liturgy*, and one long Prayer at leaſt perſonally addreſſed to *Chriſt.* [r] And he himſelf has explained his Meaning in his *Defence of the Nicene Faith. Origen* had been accuſed of *Arianiſm* for uſing the like Expreſſions. Bp *Bull* vindicates him by ſaying that *Chriſt* may be conſidered either as *God of God*, or as *Mediator* between *God and Man.* In the latter Capacity all Prayers are to be offered to *God the Father* through him: in the former he is himſelf the Object of *Worſhip.* Dr. *Clarke* has given us

[p] This Clauſe is omitted both by Dr. *Clarke*, and our *Apologiſt.* [q] Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. C. 3. N°. 6.
[r] Sect. ii. Cap. 9. N°. 15.

a Quotation

a Quotation from this very Place, immediately before the two other Quotations: but gives us ſuch Part only as might ſeem to make for him, and leaves out what goes before, and what follows after, where the Bp explains himſelf, and fully anſwers the Objection.

However our Apologiſt has produced two Teſtimonies on his Side from *Origen*, and *Lactantius*, neither of whom wrote before the third Century, and therefore can ſcarce be allowed competent Witneſſes of the Practice of the Church for the firſt three Centuries. [s] As to *Origen*, it is well known that he has been accuſed of holding heretical Doctrines, and particularly thoſe of *Arianiſm*, both by Antients, and Moderns, and powerfully vindicated by others. It muſt be allowed, that as he is a voluminous, ſo is he an haſty, and inacccurate Writer; and has expreſſed himſelf very incautiouſly, not only with regard to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, but with regard to other important Points. It is alſo generally ſuppoſed that many of his Writings

[s] See *Cave*'s Life of *Origen*—Idem Hiſt. Lit.—*Du Pin* Biblioth. Auth. Eccl. —— *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. Cap. 9. *Waterland*'s 2d Defence, P. 247, &c. —— *Fabric.* Biblioth. Græc.

have

have been interpolated, and corrupted by evil Hands. [t] The Paſſage cited in the *Apology* muſt be allowed to be very exceptionable. I do not well underſtand the good Father's Meaning. He had in the Words immediately before this Paſſage ſaid that *it is our Duty to give Thanks to Chriſt, who hath by the Will of his Father beſtowed upon us ſuch great Bleſſings, and alſo to make Interceſſion to him, as St. Stephen did, ſaying, Lord lay not this Sin to their Charge, and, after the Example of the Father of the Lunatick, ſaying, I pray, Lord, have Mercy on my Son, or myſelf, or any one elſe.* —— He here plainly teaches us to give Thanks, and *pray* to *Chriſt*, and yet in the Words immediately following ſeems to ſay that *Prayer* is to be offered not to the *Son*, but to the *Father*. [u] It ſhould ſeem that *Origen* had a Notion that there was ſome peculiar Kind of Prayer, perhaps Petition for the Forgiveneſs of Sins, which was to be addreſſed, not to the *Son*, but to the *Father* himſelf through the *Son*. If *Origen* here meant to deny that any *Worſhip* was to be paid to the *Son*, he muſt contradict himſelf in the ſame Breath. He muſt alſo contradict his own plain

[t] P. 142. [u] Annot. in loc. Oxon. Ed.

Doctrine

Doctrine in other Parts of his Works. [w] In his Book againſt *Celſus*, which is allowed to be the moſt valuable Part of his Works, he tells us that *the wiſe Men*, or *Magi*, *conceiving our Lord to be greater than all their Gods, reſolved to worſhip him; and that coming into Judæa they offered Symbols to him, who (if we may ſo ſpeak) was compounded of God and mortal Man, Gold as to a King, Myrrh as to one who was to die, and Frankincenſe as to God.* —— *And, as he was God ſuperior to the aſſiſtant Angels, being the Saviour of Mankind, the Angel rewarded their Piety in worſhipping Jeſus, by warning them not to return to Herod.* —— [x] Again, he ſays that *though Angels are ſometimes in Scripture called Gods, yet we are not commanded to worſhip, or adore, them — but to offer up all Prayer, Supplication, Interceſſion, and Thankſgiving, to the God over all by the High-Prieſt, who is above all Angels, being the living Word, and God. And we muſt alſo pray to the Word himſelf, and make Interceſſion to him, and give Thanks, and make Supplication to him,* [y] *if we can but underſtand how*

[w] Lib. i. P. 46. [x] Lib. v. P. 233. [y] See this laſt Clauſe explained, and its Senſe vindicated by Bp *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sec. ii. C. ix. N. 15. Dr. *Waterland*'s 2d Defence, Q. xvii. P. 399.

Prayer

Prayer is taken in Propriety of Speech, or in an improper Senſe. [z] Farther, as *Celſus* had objected to *Chriſtians* the Worſhip of *a mortal Man*, he makes the ſame Anſwer as other *Chriſtian* Apologiſts do, not by denying the Fact, but vindicating it, ſaying that *they believed, and were fully perſwaded, that this Jeſus was from the Beginning God, and the Son of God,* [a] *the very Word, the Wiſdom, and the Truth.* — [b] And, again in Anſwer to the ſame Objection he ſays — *If Celſus had underſtood this — I and my Father are One — and what is ſaid by the Son of God in his Prayer — as I and thou art One — he would not have thought that we worſhipped any other than the Supreme God. For he ſaith —— The Father is in me, and I in the Father — We therefore, as I ſaid, worſhip one God, the Father, and the Son, and our Reaſoning ſtands in full Force againſt others, and we do not worſhip an upſtart Being, who never exiſted before: for we believe him, who ſaid — Before Abraham was I am.* —— And after more to the like Purpoſe he ſays ——

[z] Lib. iii. P. 135. [a] ὁ αὐτόλογος καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία, καὶ ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια. [b] Lib. viii. P. 385, 6. See this Paſſage cited at Length, and explained by *Bingham* Antiq. B. xiii. C. 2. P. 566. See alſo *Origen*'s Doctrine fully ſet forth by Bp *Bull* Def. Fic. Nic. Sect. ii. C. 9.

We worſhip one God, and his only Son, and Word, and Image, with Supplications, and Prayers, to the utmoſt of our Power, offering up our Prayers to the God over all, by his Only-begotten Son, to whom firſt we offer them, beſeeching him —— as our High-Prieſt, to offer them to the God over all. —— Here we ſee a full Declaration of *Origen*'s Opinion concerning the *Divinity* of our *Bleſſed Saviour*, and the *Worſhip* due to him. Nor have we here only his private Opinion, but the full Teſtimony both of *Celſus*, and *Origen* himſelf, to plain Matter of Fact, that *Chriſt* was then worſhipped by all *Chriſtians*. *Celſus*, and other *Heathen* Writers, perpetually charged *Chriſtians* with worſhipping a dead Man. *Origen*, and all the other *Apologiſts*, do not deny this Charge. They do not ſay that no *Worſhip* was paid to *Chriſt*, as they certainly would have done, if none had been paid: but ſay that they *worſhipped Chriſt*, becauſe he was *God, one God with the Father.* [c] *Origen* alſo himſelf, in the Remains we have of his *Homilies*, offers up Prayers, and Ejaculations to *Chriſt*. And whereas our *Apologiſt* roundly aſſerts that no Worſhip was paid to the *Holy*

[c] See ſeveral Inſtances in *Bingham* as above.

Ghoſt

Ghoſt till *the latter End of the Fourth Century*, to the Proofs, and Inſtances already produced, we may add that of *Origen*. In the firſt Book of his Commentary on the Epiſtle to the *Romans* he ſays — *It is the Property of thoſe only to diſhonour their Bodies, who ſerve Idols.* —— *As for us, who worſhip and adore no Creature, but the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as we do not err in our Worſhip, ſo neither let us offend in our Actions, and Converſation.*

As to *Lactantius*, the like Exceptions lie againſt him, as againſt *Origen*, and ſtill more ſtrongly. [d] Our *Apologiſt* indeed ſets him forth as *a fine Writer, a Teacher, and Example of Religion.* We allow him to be an eloquent, and able, Defender of the *Chriſtian* Faith. [e] But he was, in the Eſtimation of the beſt Judges, more an Orator, than a Divine. He was but little ſkilled either in the ſacred Writings, or in the Doctrines of the Church. Hence he has run into the groſſeſt Miſtakes, and advanced the wildeſt Notions. [f] He ſeems, to have held two Principles, a good, and an

[d] Pref. P. iv. [e] See *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. iii. Cap. x. N. 20, &c. *Du Pin* Biblioth. *Cave* Hiſt. Lit. *Waterland* 2d Defence. [f] Inſtitut. L. ii. C. 9.

evil one. [g] And yet Mr. *L.* think *he needs no Apology for producing* a long Quotation from this Writer. Mr. *Bingham* has already fully anſwered him, and has ſhewn that this Paſſage, though very inaccurately, and improperly expreſſed, is capable of a good Senſe. It is indeed plain that *Lactantius* did not here deſign to deny our *Lord's Divinity* as the Title of the Chapter immediately preceding is —— *De Jeſu Deo et Homine* — and in that Chapter, and the preceding, he frequently calls him *God*; and proves from the Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament*, that he was to be both *God* and *Man*, particularly from *Iſaiah* vii. 14 — ix. 6 — xlv. 14 &c. — *Pſal.* xlv. 6 — cx. 1. But the fulleſt Anſwer to the Inferences drawn by Mr. *L.* from this Paſſage of *Lactantius* he himſelf has furniſhed us with in another Paſſage, [h] which he has cited from this *fine Writer*. But he there gives us the Objection made to *Chriſtians* by the *Heathen*, and leaves out *Lactantius's* Anſwer, which is full, and ſtrong, againſt him: He firſt propoſes this Objection in the 16th Chapter. — *They reproach the Chriſtians* (ſays he) *as worſhipping a Man, who was grievouſly puniſhed,*

[g] P. 122. [h] P. 147. *Lactant.* Inſtit. L. iv. C. 29.

and

and tortured by Men. He, like *Origen*, and other *Chriſtian* Writers before him, does not anſwer this by denying the Fact, but by juſtifying it. He ſpends ſeveral Chapters on the Incarnation, Sufferings, and Death of our *Bleſſed Saviour*, in which he frequently calls him God, and ſhews that it was no way abſurd that *God* ſhould take upon him human Nature, and ſuffer Death on the Croſs. —— [i] *The Jews*, he ſays, *condemned their God.* — [k] *God was crucified by the Worſhippers of God* [l] *No Man could be a perfect Teacher, unleſs he were alſo God.* — [m] *He was therefore both God, and Man, being made a Mediator between God and Man* — *He therefore came as a Mediator, that is, God in the Fleſh.* —— At laſt in the 29th Chapter he repeats the Objection propoſed before, [n] which our *Apologiſt* hath been pleaſed to quote: but there ſtops without giving us *Lactantius*'s Anſwer, which follows immediately after — *When we call the Father*

[i] Cap. xviii. [k] Ib. [l] Cap. xxiv. [m] Cap. xxv.

[n] And even this he miſtranſlates. *Lactantius* ſays that the *Chriſtians* were charged with *holding two Gods, God the Father, and God the Son*, our Tranſlator ſays they only *ſeemed to believe* this. *Lactantius* ſays that the *Chriſtians* were accuſed of *calling the ſame God eternal and mortal. The* Tranſlation ſays that *they held a ſecond God, and him alſo a mortal one.*

God,

God, and the Son God, we do not call them different Gods, nor do we ſeparate the one from the other: becauſe the Father could not be without the Son, nor can the Son be ſeparated from the Father — Since therefore the Father makes the Son, and the Son the Father, there is one Mind, one Spirit, one Subſtance to both. —— He afterwards declares that *the Father and Son are One God,* and concludes thus — *The one Supreme God cannot be worſhipped but by the Son, He who thinks to worſhip the Father alone, as he worſhips not the Son, ſo neither does he worſhip the Father. But he, who receives the* Son, *and bears his Name, he with the Son worſhips alſo the Father* — There could not be a fuller Proof not only that *Lactantius* himſelf, whatever crude Expreſſions may ſometimes have dropt from him, believed that *Chriſt* was truly *God,* and that *Worſhip* was due to him as ſuch, but that this was the Doctrine, and the Practice of the Church, in his Time. And this ſtrong Proof muſt have ſtared our *Agologiſt* in the Face, if he would have been at the Pains of reading the whole Chapter he quotes. But he takes this extraordinary Quotation at ſecond Hand from one *Ben Mordecai,* ſo that whether he is the Deceiver, or the deceived, I cannot ſay. Nor do I know who this *Ben Mordecai*

Mordecai is: but take him to be one of his own Fraternity who has perſonated a *Jew*, the better to attack the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. Let me adviſe him to conſult the Authors he quotes himſelf, and not to depend on others, not even on Dr. *Clarke* himſelf. But perhaps he would infer from hence at leaſt that the *Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt* was then unknown, becauſe the *Heathen* objected againſt the *Worſhip* only of *two Gods*. The Reaſon is plain. They did not object againſt a *Plurality of Gods:* for this they held themſelves. They objected to the *Chriſtians* that they worſhipped, and called *God*, a Man put to an ignominious Death. And therefore the *Chriſtian Apologiſts* mention, and defend, only the *Worſhip* of the *Son:* the Objection did not lead them to ſay any Thing of the *Holy Ghoſt*. What we would conclude then from ſuch Defences is that the *Worſhip of Chriſt* was then the Practice of the Church: and this is a Concluſion which cannot be conteſted. But that they did alſo worſhip the *Holy Ghoſt* full Teſtimony has been produced.

But our *Apologiſt* is pleaſed to repeat P. 161. what he told us before that *the whole Chriſtian Church in the Apoſtolick Age, made up*

up of Jews and Gentiles, was entirely Nazarene, or Unitarian, and that the Truth of the Gospel, as they held it, was preserved to the Time of Victor Bishop of Rome: nay *that these Jewish Believers subsisted till the 5th Century.* But for this he brings no Proof: he only refers to two Authors, *Mosheim*, and *Eusebius*, who both, by his own Confession, deny, and disprove, these bold Assertions.[o] That there were *Hereticks* in the first Ages of the Church, who denied the *Divinity* of *Christ*, such as *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, &c. History informs us. But the same Histories teach us that these were always condemned, and censured, as *Hereticks*, and their Doctrines rejected by the Church. [p]And the same *Primitive Fathers*, who condemn those who denied our *Saviour* to be a real Man, censure as freely those who deny his *Divinity*. It is indeed strange that our *Apolo-*

[o] See this fully proved by Bp *Bull*, Jud. Eccl. Cath. Cap. ii. — *Waterland* Import. Doct. Trin. Ch. vi. P. 245, &c. —

[p] *Iren.* Lib. i. Cap. 25, 26. Lib. iii. C. 2, 21. Lib. iv. C. 59. — *Ignat. ad Ephes.* Cap. vii. — *Justin. Martyr* Dial. *Tryph.* P. 253. — We have a Book of *Tertullian* entitled, *De Præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos*, wherein he thus expresses himself — *Johannes in Epistolâ eos maximè Antichristos vocat, qui Christum negarent in carne venisse, et qui non putarent Jesum esse Filum Dei, illud Marcion, hoc Hebion vindicavit.* Cap. xxxiii. see also C. xlviii.

gist

giſt ſhould, without any Proof, and in Contradiction to all Hiſtory, revive this idle Story of the *Nazarenes*, advanced not many Years ago by ſome *Socinian* Writers, and by the Infidel Writer *Toland*. Thoſe were fully confuted by [q] Bp *Bull*, and by *Moſheim*, the Author Mr. *L.* refers us to. He wrote an Anſwer to *Toland* — entitled — *Vindiciæ antiquæ contra Toland*—And in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* he tells us that *the Term Nazarene was originally given to all Chriſtians, and that it was afterwards appropriated to thoſe Chriſtians of Jeruſalem, who conſidered the Obſervance of the Moſaical Rites as neceſſary to Salvation. Theſe were diſtinct from the Ebionites, and were not placed by the ancient Chriſtians in the heretical Regiſter, while the latter were conſidered as a Sect, whoſe Tenets were deſtructive of the fundamental Principles of the Chriſtian Religion. But, after the ſecond Deſtruction of Jeruſalem by Adrian, they deſerted the ordinary Aſſemblies of Chriſtians, and were then reckoned a diſtinct Sect, but yet were treated by other Chriſtians with great Gentleneſs, as agreeing in the main Doc-*

[q] Jud. Eccl. Cath. Cap. ii. Sect. 10, &c.—Prim. et Apoſt. Trad. Cap. i. Sect. 6, &c. [r] B. i. P. 2. C. 5. P. 70. Cent. 11. Pt. B. 11. C. 5. P. 106.

trines of Chriſtianity. — This is Mr. *Moſheim's* Account of theſe *Nazarenes:* how totally different from that in our *Apology?*

But, it ſeems, he *wrongly underſtood* the Matter. Mr. *L.* underſtands it better. He has met with an *anonymous Writer,* [s] in *Euſebius, about the Year* 200, *who bears theſe Jewiſh Chriſtians this Teſtimony?* But what *Chriſtians?* and what *Teſtimony?* Not a Word does this Author ſay of any *Jewiſh Chriſtians;* he ſpeaks, as our Author himſelf tells us, of the Followers of *Artemon,* who is ſaid to be a Native of *Pergamus.* And what *Teſtimony* does he bear? full *Teſtimony* againſt our *Apologiſt.* He does indeed ſay that theſe *Hereticks pretended that all the Antients, and the Apoſtles themſelves held and taught the ſame Doctrines which they did, and that the Truth of the Goſpel was preſerved till the Days of Victor Bp of Rome, but was corrupted by his Succeſſor Zephyrinus.* — Thus far Mr. *L.* gives us: but, though he tells us that *this Writer would invalidate* theſe their Pretenſions, yet he, rather prudently, than honeſtly, has ſuppreſſed his Anſwer. I muſt beg leave to ſupply this Omiſſion. This

[s] Hiſt. Eccleſ. L. v. Cult.

antient

antient Writer, ſuppoſed to be *Caius* Preſbyter at *Rome*, tells us that this their vain Aſſertion *was contradicted*, not only by *Scripture*, *but by the Writings of Authors more ancient than Victor*, *as Juſtin*, *Miltiades*, *Tatian*, *and Clement*, *and many others*, *who*, *as every one knows*, *teach that Chriſt was both God and Man.* [t] He refers alſo to *Pſalms*, and *Hymns* of the Church, *wrote long ago from the Beginning by the Faithful*, *celebrating Chriſt the Word of God*, *and calling him God.* And he wonders at their *Impudence* in pretending that *Victor held their blaſphemous* Doctrines, *who excommunicated Theodotus the Author of this God-denying Hereſy*, *who held that Chriſt was a mere Man.* I will not expreſs my Wonder at Mr. *L's Impudence*, but return him my Thanks for referring us to this fine Remnant of Antiquity, which affords us the ſtrongeſt Evidence againſt him, which we could deſire. We have here the Teſtimony of an Author, who lived about the Year 200, that the *Divinity of our Bleſſed Saviour* was taught by the moſt reſpectable Writers of that Age, and thoſe preceding; that in the moſt antient Pſalms and Hymns of the Church *Chriſt* was celebrated as *God*, and

[t] This Paſſage I have quoted above P. 113.

that thoſe who denied his *Divinity* were accounted Hereticks, and caſt out of the Church. What becomes then of his confident Boaſtings that *the whole Chriſtian Church were then Arians, or Socinians?* He ſtands convicted by his own Witneſſes.

[u] The ſame *Euſebius* aſſures us that there was, before the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* by *Adrian, a Succeſſion of fifteen Biſhops there, who were Jews by Deſcent, and held the true Faith of Chriſt.* —What he eſteemed *the true Faith of Chriſt* may be ſeen from the above Quotation, as alſo from what he ſays of the *Ebionites.* [w] *Theſe*, he ſays, *believed Chriſt to be only a common Man, born of Joſeph and Mary. But there were others alſo called by the ſame Name,* who, though *they obſerved the Ceremonies of the Moſaical Law*, yet, *avoiding their abſurd Notions, believed the Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt, and that he was God, the Word, and Wiſdom of the Father* —— Theſe are plainly the *Nazarene*, or *Jewiſh Chriſtians*, here mentioned by our *Apologiſt*, and we have here the full Teſtimony of *Euſebius*, that they believed

[u] Eccleſ. Hiſt. Lib. iv. C. 5. [w] L. iii. C. 27. See *Bull* as above.

our

our *Lord's Divinity*. The ſame is atteſted alſo by *Sulpitius Severus*, a creditable Hiſtorian of the fourth Century. [x] He tells us that *the Emperor Adrian placed a Guard to keep the Jews out of Jeruſalem, which was of Service to the Chriſtian Faith: for they almoſt all, together with the Obſervance of the Law, believed Chriſt to be God.* —— To this we may add the Teſtimony of St. *Auſtin*. [y] He diſtinguiſhes the *Nazarenes* from the *Cerinthians*, and *Ebionites*. Theſe, he ſays, *held that Chriſt was only a Man:* but the *Nazarenes*, though they obſerved *the Precepts of the Law*, yet *confeſſed that Chriſt was the Son of God.* I muſt therefore take the Liberty, with Bp *Bull*, to call this our *Apologiſt's* Story of the *Nazarene Chriſtians—puditiſſimam atque impudentiſſimam fabulam.*

I muſt again thank our *Apologiſt* for another Citation from *Juſtin Martyr*, which bears full Teſtimony to our *Lord's Divinity*. To what purpoſe he cites this Paſſage I cannot tell, nor where he had his Tranſlation: it differs totally, from the Original. Whatever he has to ſay has been fully anſwered by Mr.

[x] Sac. Hiſt. Lib. ii. C. 45.

[y] Lib. de Hæreſ. C. 8, 9, 10.

Bingham.

Bingham. [z] The Paſſage has been conſidered at large, and what Obſcurities may be therein fully cleared up by Bp *Bull*, and Dr. *Waterland*. I need add but little more. But as our Author has miſerably curtailed, and miſtranſlated this Paſſage, I ſhall give Dr. *Waterland*'s Tranſlation, which he has vindicated from all Exceptions. — *Trypho the Jew* (ſays the Doctor) *in the Dialogue, having a little before told Juſtin that his Doctrines concerning Chriſt (that he was God before the World, and afterwards became Man, and of a Virgin) appeared to him a great Paradox, and contrary to common Senſe, Juſtin replies as follows, I am very ſenſible that this will look like a Paradox, and more eſpecially to thoſe of your Nation, who are in no Diſpoſition either to apprehend, or follow, the Things of God, but the Dictates only of your own Rabbins, as God himſelf proclaims. Nevertheleſs (ſaid I) O Trypho, my Argument does not fall, as to his being the Meſſiah of God, though I ſhould not be able to prove that the Son of the Maker of the Univerſe pre-exiſted, being God, and was born a Man of the Virgin, but after it has been once fully proved that he is*

[z] *Bull* Jud. Eccl. Cath. Cap. vii. — *Waterland* Import. Doct. Trin. Ch. vi. P. 382, &c. — See alſo *Thirlby* Annot. and my Vind. Doct. Trin. Pt. 3. P. 40.

the

the Meſſiah of God, (whatever elſe he be) tho' I ſhould not farther demonſtrate his Pre-exiſtence, and condeſcending to become Man of like Paſſions with us, taking Fleſh upon him according to his Father's good Pleaſure, all that you can juſtly ſay is, that I am ſo far in an Error; but you ſhould not hereupon deny that he is the Chriſt, [a] *appearing as a Man born of human Parents, and approving himſelf as the choſen Meſſiah. For (ſaid I) my good Friends, ſome there are of our Profeſſion (or of your Nation) who acknowledge him to be the Meſſiah, yet conceive of him, as of a Man born of human Parents, whom however I aſſent not to, no not though there were ever ſo many concurring to tell me ſo, ſince we are commanded by Chriſt himſelf not to ſubmit to the Doctrines of Men, but to what the holy Prophets have delivered, and himſelf hath taught us.* —— I hope the Reader will pardon this long Quotation, as it will appear from hence how grievouſly Mr. *L.* has mangled poor *Juſtin*, and not only how little it is to his Purpoſe, but how ſtrongly it proves againſt him. This Paſſage fully

[a] I ſhould rather tranſlate this — *although he ſhould appear to be a Man born of human Parents, and appointed by Election to be the Meſſiah.*

ſhews

ſhews that *Juſtin*, and other *Chriſtians* in his Time, the ſecond Century, (the *Ebionites* only excepted) firmly believed that *Chriſt pre-exiſted, as God, before the World began*; that they looked upon this as the Doctrine of the *Prophets*, and of *Chriſt himſelf*; and that it appeared otherwſe only to thoſe, *who were in no Diſpoſition, either to apprehend, or follow, the Things of God.*

[b] His Pretence that *theſe early Fathers brought their Platonick Doctrines into Chriſtianity has* been already conſidered. He brings indeed no Proof of it, but only a general Reference to *numerous Inſtances in their Writings.* Pray did he ever read theſe Writings? From his Citations, which we have examined, we have Reaſon to believe, and ought charitably to hope, that he never did. The Reverſe of this is moſt true. In the Paſſage juſt cited from *Juſtin*, we are told that *Trypho*, and his Brethren, could not receive the Doctrine of the *Incarnation*, becauſe *it appeared to them paradoxical, and contrary to common Senſe.* [c] And *Irenæus* tells us that the *Hereticks* of his Time borrowed many of their wild No-

[b] P. 158. [c] Adv. Hæreſ. Lib. ii. Cap. 19.

tions

tions from *Plato*, and other heathen Philoſophers. [d] *Tertullian* alſo ſays that the *Hereſies* of his Time, among which he reckons thoſe of *Ebion*, and *Cerinthus*, who denied our *Lord's Divinity, took their Riſe from Philoſophy*; and that the *Hereticks* were Followers of *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Zeno*, or *Epicurus*. And the Writer cited by *Euſebius*, as above, aſcribes the Errors of the *Anti-Trinitarians* in his Time to their Attachment to *Philoſophy*. I entirely agree therefore with our *Apologiſt* that [e] *Science falſely ſo called firſt led Men into Errors concerning the true Perſon, and true Character, of our Saviour Chriſt*. The *Divinity*, and *Incarnation* of the *Son of God* are taught in *Scripture* in plain Terms — [f] *The Word was God* — and — *The Word was made Fleſh*. — If Creeds were added, it was to guard the Truth againſt the Evaſions of thoſe who would explain away the plain Truth; [g] and *through Philoſophy and vain Deceit deny the Incarnation of Chriſt, in whom dwelleth all the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*.

[h] Another Topick of Declamation in the *Apology* is that *human Authority was a prin-*

[d] Præſcript. adv. Hær. Cap. vii. &c. [e] P. 153. [f] *Joh.* i. 1. 14. [g] *Coloſſ.* ii. 8, 9. [h] P. 162, &c.

cipal Source of the Corruption of the true Chriſtian Doctrine and Worſhip. For Victor Biſhop of Rome excommunicated Theodotus, a Jewiſh Chriſtian, for not coming up to his own Opinion concerning Chriſt, which was that afterwards called Arian, and happened then and there chiefly to prevail. —— This is far above my Comprehenſion. Pray, good Sir, who was the *Arian, Victor*, or *Theodotus?* and whoſe, and what, *Opinion then and there prevailed?* This *Theodotus*, as we learn [i] from *Euſebius*, [k] and other Authors, was no *Jewiſh Chriſtian*, but a Citizen of *Byzantium*, who had denied *Chriſt* in Time of Perſecution, and afterwards going to *Rome* became the Ringleader of a Sect, who, among other ſtrange Doctrines, held *Chriſt* to be a mere Man. Him *Victor* caſt out of the Church: and ſo, I humbly apprehend, he was authorized to do, by the conſtant Practice of the Church, [l] and the Apoſtles themſelves. But how ſhall we reconcile theſe Matters? Our Author has given us a third hand Quotation from *Euſebius*, which, if it proved any Thing, would prove that *the*

[i] Eccleſ. Hiſt. L. v. C. 28. L. ii. C. 5. *Epiphan.* Hær. liv. 1. [2] *Job.* 10.

[k] *Theodorit.* Hæret. Fab. [l] See *Tit.* iii. 10 —

whole

whole Chriſtian Church was entirely Unitarian till the Times of *Victor*'s Succeſſor *Zephyrinus*, who is ſaid to be *the firſt who corrupted the Truth*. And now we are told that *Victor* himſelf *excommunicated* theſe *Unitarians*, and ſo eſtabliſhed *his own Opinion*. But a little before we were told that *thoſe very early Fathers, Irenæus, and Juſtin Martyr, brought into Chriſtianity the Platonick Doctrine of a Second God* half a *Century* before *Victor*'s Time. Here then we have three Stories, all of them falſe: and, as they are not eaſily reconcilable with one another, ſo are they all utterly inconſiſtent with our Author's main Poſition, that *all Chriſtian People, for upwards of three hundred Years after Chriſt, till the Council of Nice, were generally Unitarians, what is now called either Arian, or Socinian*.

But perhaps he may have more Reaſon to complain of the Exerciſe of Authority, *when the Emperors had embraced Chriſtianity*. [m] A heavy Charge we have indeed againſt theſe *Chriſtian Emperors*: but with very little Proof to ſupport it. I find quite a different Account in the learned Mr. *Bingham*'s Antiquities. [n]

[m] P. 164, &c. [n] Antiq. B. xvi. Ch. 2. Sect. 4. — See alſo *Moſheim* Cent. iv. P. 220.

After ſetting forth at full the Imperial Laws againſt *Hereſy*, he thus concludes —— *Now from all this it is plain that whatever Favour, or Aſſiſtance, the ancient Church required of the Civil Magiſtrate to back her Diſcipline with againſt Hereticks, or other Delinquents, ſhe never deſired them to unſheath the Sword in her Cauſe, or puniſh them with Death; but always interpoſed in their behalf, that they might have the Favour to live, and repent, if ever any ſanguinary Laws (which were very rare, and no ways encouraged, or approved, by the Church) were made againſt them. The Diſcipline of Fire and Faggot and Inquiſitions, and a thouſand other Tortures, which under Pretence of Mercy has ſpilt ſo much Chriſtian Blood, are Inventions of later Ages, and more corrupt and degenerate Times, when Men had forgot the Spirit of Chriſtianity, and the Character of our Bleſſed Lord, who came not to deſtroy Men's Lives, but to ſave them.*—Where then are we to find theſe *ſanguinary Laws of the Emperors againſt thoſe who differed from them from Conſtantine incluſive*, which our Author complains of? There is not one to be met with in the whole *Code* till *Theodoſius*'s Time. He firſt made a Decree, not againſt the *Arians*, but againſt ſome particular Sects of the *Manichees*, that they ſhould be puniſhed with Death.

This

This Law may be ſuppoſed to have been made upon ſome particular Provocation of their Enormities, ſuch as theſe *Manichees* were guilty of. Nor can I find any Inſtance, before *Priſcillian*, of any *Heretick* ſuffering Death: and he too was accuſed of other wicked and lewd Practices. [o] Nor was he an *Arian*, but a Kind of *Manichee*. He was charged with holding ſeveral wild, and impious Tenets. As to the Doctrine of the Trinity, he is ſaid to have been a *Sabellian*. He was put to Death about A. D. 385, but not by any *Chriſtian Emperor*, but by the Uſurper *Maximus*. He ſuffered indeed by the Proſecution of *Ithacius*, a Biſhop, but of no very good Character: but the Fact was greatly condemned by all orthodox *Chriſtians*, and particularly by *Martin* Bp of *Tours*, who beſought *Maximus* to abſtain from the Blood of this poor Man, for Expulſion from the Church, by the Sentence of the Biſhop, was fully ſufficient. In the ſame Sentiments were the other *Chriſtian* Fathers. [p] St. *Chryſoſtom* tells us that *Chriſt hath forbid us to put Hereticks to Death, but not to reſtrain them,*

o *Sulpit. Sever.* Hiſt. Sacr. Lib. 2. — *Auguſt.* de Hereſ. 70. *Leo.* Magn. Epiſt. xv. vel xciii. — *Cave* Hiſt. Lit. — *Du Pin.* Nouv. Biblioth. p Hom. xlvi. in Matt. xiii.

or

or ſtop their Mouths, or forbid their Meetings. [q] St. *Auſtin* in his Epiſtle to *Dulcitius* tells *him that he did not receive the Power of the Sword, nor was by any Laws, or imperial Injunctions, commanded to put Hereticks to Death.* [r] And in his Book againſt *Creſconius* he ſays that, *no good Men in the Catholick Church are pleaſed to have any one, though an Heretick, proſecuted to Death.* But I ſuppoſe our *Apologiſt* will call all Kinds of Laws to reſtrain *Hereticks* by the Name of Perſecution. [s] He has quoted *Moſheim* to ſhew that *Theodoſius the Great raiſed the ſecular Arm againſt the Arians with a terrible Degree of Violence:* and we are told in a Note, that *Amphilochius*, whom in Deriſion he calls a *Saint, inſtigated him to this inhuman Work.* What *inhuman Work?* [t] Did this *Saint Amphilochius inſtigate the Emperor* to proceed with Fire and Faggot againſt theſe *Arians*, or any way to injure their Perſons, or Properties. No: he only deſired him to forbid their Meetings. Nor did the Emperor at his Inſtigation put any *Arian* to Death, or raiſe any Perſecution againſt them. He only

[q] Epiſt. lxi. [r] Lib. iii. C. 50. [s] P. 25.
[t] See *Sozomen* Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. vii. C. 6. — *Theodoret.* L. v. C. 16.

forbad

forbad their Conventicles, which has been the Practice of all *Chriſtian* States from the firſt Eſtabliſhment of *Chriſtianity* to this Day. I cannot indeed but think the learned *Moſheim* to blame for ſpeaking in ſuch high Terms of the Proceedings of *Theodoſius* againſt the *Arians*, and paſſing over ſo ſlightly the Severities of *Conſtantius*, and *Valens*, againſt the *Catholicks*. [u] *Theodoſius the Great* is allowed by all the beſt Hiſtorians to have been an excellent Prince, and eminent not only for his Piety, but for his great Moderation, and Clemency. When he came to the Throne he found the Church rent by Diviſions. Thoſe who adhered to the *Nicene* Faith had been cruelly perſecuted by *Valens*, and deprived of their Biſhopricks. *Theodoſius* took great Pains both to enquire into the Truth, and to ſettle Matters between the contending Parties. When he found this could not be done, being himſelf convinced of the Truth of the *Nicene* Faith, he reſtored the orthodox Clergy, turned out the *Arians*, and forbad their meeting in Conventicles. And when they ſtill continued obſtinate, and raiſed Diſturbances in the Church, though he had at firſt treated them

u *Socrat.* Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. v. — *Sozomen* Lib. vii. — *Theodorit* Lib. v.

with

with great Lenity, he enacted ſome ſevere Laws againſt them. But theſe, as [w] *Sozomen* aſſures us, he never put in Execution, but deſigned them only *in terrorem*. However, as I am no Friend to Perſecution, ſo I am not diſpoſed, nor think myſelf concerned, to vindicate every Decree, which the *Chriſtian* Emperors publiſhed againſt *Hereticks*, nor all Meaſures taken by the orthodox Clergy, [x] eſpecially as our *Apologiſt* is ſo juſt as to own that both Parties were guilty of theſe Practices, *Arian*, as well as *Homoouſian*. [y] And Mr. *Moſheim* tells us *that unjuſtifiable Meaſures were taken, and great Exceſſes committed on both Sides*. And he thinks it *difficult to determine, which of the two exceeded moſt the Bounds of Probity, Charity, and Moderation*. — I cannot think ſo. Whoever reads the Acounts given by Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians of the Perſecutions raiſed [z] againſt *Athanaſius*, and his Adherents, by the *Arian* Party, the Severities exerciſed by [a] *Conſtantius*, and [b] *Valens*, who perſecuted

[w] Lib. vii. C. 12. [x] P. 165. [y] Cent. iv. C. 5. [z] *Socrat.* Hiſtor. Eccl. Lib. i. C. 27, 28, &c. — *Sozomen* Lib. ii. C. 22, &c. — *Theodorit.* L. i. C. 26, &c. [a] *Socrat.* Lib. ii. C. 16, 26, &c. — *Sozomen* Lib. iii. C. 5, &c. L. iv. C. 2, &c. — *Theodorit.* Lib. ii. C. 13, &c. [b] *Socrat.* L. iv. C. 2, &c. 16, &c. — *Sozom.* Lib. vi. C. 7, &c. — *Theodorit.* L. iv. C. 13, &c.

the

the *Homoousians* even to Death; [c] and the Cruelties practiſed by the *Goths*, *Vandals*, and *Hunns*, and that on account of Religion, will eaſily judge on which Side the greateſt Exceſſes were committed. This at leaſt he will ſee how little Reaſon our Author has to inveigh ſo bitterly againſt the Emperor *Theodoſius*, and how little Pretence he has to aſcribe the Prevalence of the *Nicene Faith* to the Perſecutions of the *Arians*. And this eſpecially if we conſider [d] what *Moſheim* tells us, that, *when theſe Ravages were over, in the Days of Juſtinian, the Arian Sect declined apace, and could never afterwards recover any Degree of Stability.*

But our *Apologiſt*, not content with the Alliance of the *Goths*, *Vandals*, and *Hunns*, is eager to liſt into his Party all that he can lay hold of, and compel them to come in. [e] *The Neſtorians*, he tells us, *were in general Unitarians, and are now in great Numbers all over the Eaſt.* And for the Truth of this he quotes *Moſheim*, who ſays the direct contrary in the

[c] *Evagr.* Scholaſt. Eccl. Hiſt. L. iv. C. 14. — *Victor Vitenſis* de Perſecut. Afric.—*Procop.* de Bell. Vandal. L. 1. C. 8.
[d] Cent. vi. P. 2. C. 5. [e] P. 27.

very Sentence here quoted. But he gives us only one little Scrap of this Sentence. He might probably hope to perſwade *the leſs learned* Reader that, as *Neſtorius* denied *the Virgin Mary* to be *the Mother of God*, he alſo denied *Chriſt* to be *God*. [f] But Mr. *Moſheim* ſeems to think that *Neſtorius* was rather hardly uſed, and that *the Difference* between him, and his Adverſaries *was only in Words* — He concludes with the Sentence, of which Mr. *L.* gives us only the latter Part — *The Doctrine of the Neſtorians was, that in the Son of God there were two Perſons, or* Ὑποστάσεις, *of which the one was divine, even the eternal Word, the other, which was human, was the Man Jeſus, that theſe two Perſons had only one Aſpect, that the Union between the Son of God, and the Son of Man, was formed in the Moment of the Virgin's Conception, and was never to be diſſolved, that it was not an Union of Nature, or of Perſon, but only of Will and Affection: that Chriſt was therefore to be carefully diſtinguiſhed from God, who dwelt in him, as in his Temple, and that Mary was to be called the Mother of Chriſt, and not the Mother of God.* — I have quoted this Sentence

f Cent. v. P. ii. C. 5. P. 268.

at

at large, to ſhew how very unfair our *Apologiſt* is in his Quotations. It appears from this very Paſſage that, according to *Moſheim*, *Neſtorius* held both the *Eternity*, and the *Divinity*, of the S*on of God.* The like Account of his Tenets is given both by [g] Dr. *Cave*, and [h] *Du Pin.* [i] *Socrates* alſo informs us that *Neſtorius* was not only no *Arian*, but a violent Enemy to all the *heretical* Sects, the *Arians* in particular; that he inſtigated the Emperor to perſecute them, and that he himſelf attempted to pull down a Church of the *Arians:* and he blames him for his perſecuting Spirit. [k] *Socrates* farther tells us that, though ſome of his Enemies accuſed him of making *Chriſt* a mere Man, the contrary appeared from his Writings, and from the Teſtimony of his Followers. His Error conſiſted not in denying the *Divinity* of Chriſt, but the Union of the *divine* and *human* Nature in him. And againſt this Error that Article of the *Athanaſian Creed* ſeems to have been levelled — *Who, although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Chriſt.* [l] There are alſo ſeve-

[g] Hiſt. Lit. L. vii. C. 29, 31. [h] Nouv. Biblioth. [k] Ib. C. 32. [i] Hiſt. Eccl. [l] See many of theſe Fragments among the Works of *Marius Mercator*, publiſhed by *Garnerius*.

ral Fragments of *Neſtorius* extant, in which he expreſsly affirms the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, declares his Aſſent to the *Nicene Faith*, and condemns *Arius*, and his Doctrines. And that the *Neſtorians* now in the Eaſt hold the ſame Doctrines with their Founder, I refer him for Proof to the ſame learned [m] *Moſheim*, and the Authors cited by him.

Againſt this full Proof, which our *Apologiſt* might, or rather muſt, have ſeen in the very Author he quotes, he has given us in a Note a moſt curious Argument to prove that the *Neſtorians could not well be other than Unitarians*. *Theodore Biſhop of Mopſueſtia* would not allow the Confeſſion of St. *Thomas* to *Chriſt*, *Joh.* xx. 28. to be a Proof of our *Lord's Divinity*. But *Neſtorius*, and his Followers, *ſtrictly adhered to and reverenced his Name and Writings*. Therefore *Theodore* himſelf, and all theſe his Admirers, muſt be *Arians*. And for this he quotes Dr. *Lardner*. But if we look into Dr. *Lardner*, we ſhall find that he does not quote this from any Work of *Theodore* now extant: but from *the Acts of the Council of Conſtantinople*. And he tells us *they are alledged*

[m] Cent. xvi. C. 2. S. 3.

in

in the Way of Reproach, and are among Charges brought againſt him. And perhaps the Quotations are not quite exact and fair. —— But all this our *Apologiſt* has wiſely omitted. It is ſurely, neither reaſonable, nor poſſible, to judge of any Man's Opinion from ſuch an Extract as this is. Suppoſing, the moſt that can be inferred from this Paſſage, that *Theodore* really put *this fine Interpretation* on this Text of *Scripture*, it will not follow that he did not believe our *Lord's Divinity*. He might infer this from many other Texts. Much leſs will it follow that all who *reverenced his Name were Arians*. I have ſhewn above that this Confeſſion of St. *Thomas* was a full Proof of *Chriſt's Divinity:* but I don't call every one, who thinks otherwiſe, an *Arian*. I have alſo proved the Worſhip of *Chriſt* from 1 *Cor.* i. 2. but though Dr. *Hammond* gives another, and I think, a very wrong, Interpretation of this Text, I am well aſſured he was neither *Arian*, nor *Socinian*. The Truth of the Matter is that both *Neſtorius*, and *Eutyches*, had greatly diſturbed the Church by their curious Queſtions, and idle Diſputes, about the Union of the two Natures in *Chriſt*, and Things were carried with great Heat,

and

and Animoſities, on both Sides.[n] This Council of *Conſtantinople* ſeems to have acted with more Zeal, than Prudence, or Temper. They were not content with condemning *Neſtorius*, but proceeded againſt all who bore any Relation to him, and from Extracts out of their Writings charged them with heterodox Opinions, which they themſelves never dreamt of. And therefore we can form no Judgment of any Man's Opinions from ſuch partial Extracts. Does Mr. *L.* conſult Authors only to pick out ſuch little Scraps, as may ſeem to favour his Opinion? He might have learnt from this Account of *Theodore* by Dr. *Lardner*, which he refers to, that he lived and died in the Communion of the Church; and that he was in high Eſteem among all his Cotemporaries. [o] *Socrates* tells us that he was a Friend and Companion of St. *Chryſoſtom.* [p] *Sozomen* ſays the ſame, and commends him as *a Man well verſed in Scripture, and other Parts of Learning, and Philoſophy.* [q] *Theodoret* tells us that he was *an eminent Teacher, and had vigorouſly oppoſed all the Crews of Hereticks*;

[n] *Moſheim* Cent. vi. P. 2. C. 3. [o] Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. iv. C. 3. [p] Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. viii. C. 2. [q] Lib. v. C. 27, 40. See alſo *Cave* Hiſt. Lit. —— *Du Pin.* Nouv. Biblioth.

that

that he continued Bishop 36 *Years, contending against the Followers of Arius, Eunomius, and Apollinarius.* Nor was this *Theodore* ever accused of *Heresy* in his Life-time. And, when after his Death this Charge was brought against him, he was powerfully vindicated by *Vigilius,* and *Facundus.* [r] *Facundus*'s Vindication is now extant: in which he proves from *Theodore*'s own Works that he was orthodox in the Doctrine of the *Trinity.* I shall quote only one Passage out of many. He says that *Christ was both God and Man, both according to Nature the true God, and essentially the true Son of the true God. Theodore* also wrote against *Eunomius,* and *Apollinarius,* and an *Exposition of the Nicene Faith.* We have also his *Confession of Faith* preserved by *Marius Mercator,* who wrote against him. There he says, *We confess the Father to be a proper Person, and so likewise the Son, and so likewise the Holy Ghost, and preserving the Word of Godliness, we do not think the Father, the Son, and the Goly Hhost to be three different Essences, but one in the Unity of the Godhead. If therefore* we may judge of the Faith of these *Nestorians* from the Writings either of *Nestorius,*

[r] *Facund.* Lib. ix. C. 2. P. 132.

or

or his Master *Theodorus*, they were indeed *Unitarians*, and so I hope we are all, but not in Mr. *L*'s Sense of the Word. They received the *Nicene Faith*, and held the Doctrine of a *Trinity in Unity*.

[s] Our *Apologist* skips from the fourth Century to the tenth, where he can find no Associates but some *Lombards*, and other *barbarous Nations*. Towards *the Close of the eleventh Century* he claims *Roscellin Canon of Compiegne*, and quotes *Mosheim* for it. [t] But as *Mosheim* tells us that he was charged not with Arianism, but Tritheism, so his learned Commentator Mr. *Macklaine* acquits him of this Charge. He observes that it must be considered that *the learned Men now mentioned, (Fulco and Anselm) were the inveterate Enemies of Roscellin, and that they perhaps comprehended his Meaning imperfectly, or perverted it willingly. Several Circumstances prove that some of his Adversaries were in one, or the other, of these two Cases. Anselm himself furnishes sufficient Grounds for this Suspicion, since, notwithstanding his Aversion to the Nominalists, of which Roscellin was the chief, he grants that the Opinion*

[s] P. 28. [t] Cent, xi. P. 2. Ch. 5. P. 548.

of

of his Antagoniſt may be admitted, or at leaſt tolerated, in a certain Senſe, and even that he is not perfectly aſſured of underſtanding fully his Meaning, and that he believes the Sentiments of that Eccleſiaſtick to be leſs pernicious than his Accuſers have repreſented them.

[u] In the ſame Manner our *Apologiſt* takes his Account of *the famous Abelard's* Tenets from *the Charge brought againſt him* by his Enemies. And yet from this very *Charge* it appears, that he was not ſo *completely an Unitarian* as our Author would wiſh him. If *he corrupted the Doctrine of the Trinity*, he muſt believe a *Trinity*. If *he entertained unworthy and falſe Conceptions of the Union of the two Natures in Chriſt*, he muſt believe that *the two Natures*, divine and human, were in ſome ſort *united in him*. But *Moſheim* himſelf, from whom our *Apologiſt* takes his Account, vindicates him from this Charge, in the Words immediately following, which Mr. *L.* with his uſual Unfairneſs has thought proper to paſs by. —— [w] *It muſt be confeſſed* (ſays he) *by thoſe who are acquainted with the Writings of Abelard, that he expreſſed himſelf in a very ſingular, and incongruous Man-*

[u] P. 29. [w] Cent. xii.

ner upon ſeveral Points of Theology, and this indeed is one of the Inconveniences, to which ſubtle Refinements upon myſterious Doctrines frequently lead. But it is certain on the other Hand, that St. Bernard, who had much more Genius, than Logick, miſunderſtood ſome of the Opinions of Abelard, and wilfully perverted others. [x] The like Account is given by all the beſt Hiſtorians. And his Apology is now extant, in which, after ſome Excuſes made for ſome crude Expreſſions, he denies every Part of the Charge brought againſt him, and declares, amongſt other Things, that he believes that *Jeſus Chriſt is the true and only Son of God, born of the Subſtance of the Father before all Ages*; and that *the Holy Spirit is the third Perſon of the Trinity, who proceeds from the Father, and the Son.* There is alſo among his Works a ſhort Expoſition of St. *Athanaſius's Creed*, in which he profeſſes his Aſſent to that *Creed*, and ſays that *we not only believe, but worſhip three Perſons in the Unity of the*

x See *Du Pin.* Nouv. Biblioth. — *Cave* Hiſt. Lit. — Mr. *Bayle* in his Dictionary tells us that his Enemies *had cauſed a Belief that he admitted three Gods. Yet 'tis very certain that he was very orthodox on the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that all the Proceſſes made againſt him on that Matter are pitiful Cavils, that proceeded either from Malice, or Ignorance.*

Godhead.

Godhead. This is Mr. *L's complete Unitarian*, as *complete* an one as *Athanaſius* himſelf. But he chooſes to give us his Doctrines, not from himſelf, but from the *colouring, and Repreſentation of his Adverſaries.* And this he takes from *Moſheim*, but takes no Notice of the Paragraph immediately following, where *Moſheim* in great Meaſure acquits him from this Charge. Such reaſoning really deſerves no better Name than, what Mr. *Bayle* calls it, *pitiful Cavilling.*

[y] I ſhall leave our *Apologiſt* in quiet Poſſeſſion of his *Paſaginians*, an obſcure Sect, of whom I can find but little Notice of in Hiſtory. [z] *Moſheim* tells us that *their two chief religious Tenets were, firſt that the Obſervation of the Law of Moſes was obligatory on all Chriſtians, in conſequence of which they circumciſed their Followers, &c. Secondly, that Chriſt was no more than the firſt, and pureſt Creature of God.* And, he alſo tells us, that this wild Sect *expired ſoon after their Birth.*

I do not find that our *Apologiſt* any where lays claim to the *Waldenſes*, as *complete Unita-*

[y] P. 31. [z] Cent. xii. P. 2. C. 5. P. 618.

rians: [a] but he has given us at the End of his Appendix *their Confeſſion of Faith, which was preſented to Francis* I. 1541. which he extolls highly for its *admirable Simplicity, and Conformity to Scripture.* This he has taken from [b] Mr. *Morland*'s Hiſtory of theſe Churches. But with what View he has inſerted it I know not. Would he from hence infer, or inſinuate, that theſe Men were of the ſame Principles with himſelf? Was this the only *Confeſſion of Faith,* which we have of theſe *Waldenſes?* No. [c] The ſame Mr. *Morland* but a few Pages before gives us *an antient Confeſſion of Faith of theſe Waldenſes out of certain Manuſcripts bearing Date A.D.* 1120. The ſecond Article of which is—*We do believe there is one God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* — [d] And a few Pages after we have *an Abbreviation of their Confeſſion of Faith which was preſented to Ladiſlaus King of Bohemia* A. D. 1508. by ſome of his Subjects of the ſame Faith with theſe *Wal-*

[a] P. 175. [b] We are obliged to our Author for referring us to this curious Book of Mr. *Morland*'s, where may be ſeen an Account of the Antiquity of theſe Churches of the *Waldenſes*, their Faith and Practice; how many Years before *Luther* they oppoſed the Errors of the *Church of Rome*, and what cruel Perſecutions, and Maſſacres, were brought on them by the Inſtigation of the *Popes of Rome*, to the eternal Infamy of that Church. [c] P. 30. [d] P. 43.

denſes,

denſes, wherein they declare that *they taught that God is known, by Faith in the Scriptures, to be One as to the Subſtance of the Divinity, and three Perſons, viz. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that as to the Perſons there is a Difference, but as to the Eſſence and Subſtance, Coequality, and Indiſtinction.* [e] And they refer to the *Nicene*, and *Athanaſian*, *Creed*. The ſame Author has given us *a Confeſſion of Faith publiſhed by the reformed Churches of Piemont A. D.* 1658, the firſt Article of which is that *there is one only God, a ſpiritual Eſſence, &c. and that there are three Perſons in that one, only, and ſimple, Eſſence, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.* [f] In the ſame Book we have an Account of *the ancient Diſcipline of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piemont, extracted out of divers authentick Maſcripts written in their own Language ſeveral hundreds of Years before either Calvin, or Luther*. Amongſt the reſt we have *the Catechiſm of theſe antient Waldenſes*. One Queſtion is — *Whereby canſt thou know that thou believeſt in Chriſt?* --- The Anſwer is --- *By this that I know him to be true God, and true Man* --- Another Queſtion is. — *Doſt thou believe in*

[e] P. 61. [f] Chap. 5. P. 72, &c.

the

the Holy Spirit? Anſw. —— *Yes, I do believe. For the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and the Son, and according to the Divinity is equal to the Father, and to the Son.* Laſtly, We have an Extract from *ſeveral Treatiſes of theſe Evangelical Churches,* [g] in one of which they declare againſt all *Invocation of Saints,* and ſay that *no Man bodily born whoſoever, but Chriſt, ought to be adored*; [h] and again, *that it were far more expedient to adore Chriſt alone of all Men, he being abſolutely the beſt and kindeſt Mediator.* From all this it appears abundantly how little Mr. *L's* Quotation from their *Confeſſion is to his purpoſe.* They could never mean to exclude the *Worſhip of Chriſt.* They believed him to be *God, adored him,* and thought his *Worſhip comformable to Scripture.* [i] As to their *Confeſſion of Faith preſented to Francis* I, the Deſign of it was to vindicate themſelves from the Calumnies of their Enemies, who threatened them with a Perſecution. It is a very ſound one. They declare their Belief that *in Jeſus Chriſt dwelleth all the Godhead bodily.* If it is not ſo explicit with regard to the *Doctrine of the Trinity,* as ſome of their other Confeſſions are, it might be

[g] Ch. vii. P. 169. [h] P. 171. [i] See *Thuan,* Hiſt. Lib. vi. P. 189. — *Sleidan* Hiſt. Lib. xvi. P. 347.

becauſe

becauſe they were never accuſed by their Adverſaries of denying this Doctrine. [k] The Popiſh Inquiſitors, who drew up Articles againſt them, never charged them with this. [l] *Reinerius*, a Popiſh Author, who wrote againſt theſe *Waldenſes*, and is cited by A-Bp *Uſher* in his Treatiſe *de Chriſtianarum Eccleſiarum ſucceſſione et ſtatu*, complains that *this Sect of the Waldenſes was the moſt pernicious of any, becauſe they carried with them a great Shew of Godlineſs, as they lived honeſtly with Men, thought well in all Things of God, and believed all the Articles of the Creed, only they blaſphemed, and hated the Church of Rome.*

I ſhall readily indeed acknowledge that there have been in all Ages of *Chriſtianity*, from the Days of the Apoſtles down to the preſent Times, Perſons who have denied the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and the *Divinity* of our *Bleſſed Saviour*. Such were *Ebion*, and *Cerinthus* in the *Apoſtolick* Age, againſt whom, [m] as we are told by good Authority, St. *John*

[k] *Morland* B. ii. C. 1. [l] Cap. vi. P. 151. See alſo *Cave* Hiſt. Lit. — *Moſheim* Cent. xii. P. 2. C. 5. P. 616. — *Allix*'s Hiſt. of the Churches of *Piemont*. [m] *Iren.* L. iii. C. 11, 18. — *Tertull.* Præſcript. C. 33. —— *Hieron* de viris illuſtr. Prolog. in *Matt.* —— *Epiphan.* Hæreſ. L. ii. P. 423. See *Waterland* Import. Doct. Trin. Ch. vi.

wrote

wrote both his *Goſpel*, and *Epiſtles*, [n] and he calls them *Deceivers*, and *Antichriſts*. Such there were alſo in the following Ages, both before, and after, the *Council of Nice*. But they have been always condemed as *Hereticks* by the *Catholick Church*, and caſt out of her Communion. But, that *religious Worſhip is to be paid to God the Father only, and not to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, I do not find that any of them ever held. [o] And this was the bold Aſſertion, which our *Apologiſt* undertook the Proof of. But he will not find among them all any ſuch *complete Unitarians* as himſelf. His *Nazarene Chriſtians*, *the Church of Jeruſalem*, and all other *Chriſtian* Churches, both before, and ſince *the Council of Nice*, have thought it their Duty to worſhip the *Son of God*. Not only *Neſtorius*, and his Maſter *Theodorus*, *Roſcellin*, *Abelard*, and the *Waldenſes*, but *Arius* himſelf, and all his Followers, in *Aſia*, *Africa*, and *Europe*, and among the *Goths*, *Vandals*, *Hunns*, and *Lombards*, were *Worſhippers of Chriſt*. And ſo have been our modern *Arians*, and *Socinians*. [p] His great Apoſtle Dr. *Clarke* expreſsly teaches us that

[n] 1 *Joh.* ii. 22. — iv. 3. — 2 *Joh.* 7.
[o] P. 119, 147.
[p] Script. Doct. Trin. Pt. ii. Sect. 50.

Worſhip

Worſhip is to be paid to the Son, by offering him *Praiſe and Thankſgiving*, *invocating him in Prayer*, &c. And the late *Bp of Clogher* in his *Eſſay on Spirit* calls our *Lord* the *ſecond Jehovah*, and pleads ſtrongly for *Worſhip* due to him as ſuch. *Socinus* alſo, though he held *Chriſt* to be not *God*, but only *Man*, yet held *Worſhip* to be due to him, [q] as our Author himſelf tells us. And when *Franciſcus Davides*, and ſome others in *Tranſylvania*, more dangerous, but more conſiſtent, *Hereticks*, denied the *Worſhip of Chriſt*, [r] *Socinus* was greatly provoked, wrote againſt him with great Bitterneſs, and called him a *Blaſphemer*, *more than an Heretick, and unworthy the Name of a Chriſtian*. And the *Socinians* depoſed theſe Men, and caſt them out of their Communion. And *Davides* was at their Inſtigation caſt into Priſon, where he died a miſerable Death. Accordingly in the *Racovian Catechiſm* we find the *Worſhip of Chriſt* defended on the ſame Principles, as the *Romaniſts* defend the *Worſhip of Saints, and Angels*. [s] And to the Queſtion

[q] P. 138. [r] *Socin.* contra Vujek Ch. 2. — *Moſheim* Hiſt. Eccleſ. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Pt. 2. Ch. 4.

[s] *Quid vero ſentis de iis hominibus, qui Chriſtum non invocant, nec adorandum cenſent? — Prorſus non eſſe Chriſtianos ſentio, cum re ipſâ Chriſtum non habeant, et licet verbis id negare non audeant, re ipſâ negent tamen.*

 — What

—— *What think you of thoſe who hold that Chriſt is not to be worſhipped* — The Anſwer is *I think they are by no means Chriſtians.* In vain then does Mr. *L.* look out for *his complete Unitarians* either in ancient, or modern Times. He has, I believe, the Honour of being the Author of the firſt Sect (unleſs perhaps theſe *Tranſylvanians)* who called themſelves *Chriſtians*, and yet denied that any *Worſhip* was due to *Chriſt*, and his *Liturgy* is the firſt *Liturgy*, wherein *the Worſhip of Chriſt* was omitted.

It does not fall within the Compaſs of my Deſign to follow him any farther. I could point out groſs Miſrepreſentations in his *Engliſh* Hiſtory. But I think I have followed him far enough, and I believe the Reader will think ſo too. I ſhall not therefore attempt to derogate from the Character of his Martyrs, and Confeſſors, but leave him to enjoy his good Opinion of them. Nor do I approve of any *ſanguinary Laws*, or Perſecution for Conſcience ſake. I ſhall not juſtify, or apologize for, *Calvin's* Treatment of *Servetus*, or any other like Severities. Only one Thing I would obſerve to him, that thoſe, who were condemned for *Hereſy* here in *England* in the firſt Ages of the

the Reformation, did not ſuffer merely for denying the *Divinity of Chriſt*. They were *Anabaptiſts* from *Germany*, as Bp *Burnet*, and our Author from him, tells us. Let him then look into *Sleidan*, *Seckendorf*, and other Hiſtorians of thoſe Times, and he will find that they not only held the moſt dangerous Tenets ſubverſive of all Government, but were guilty of the groſſeſt Enormities, had raiſed the moſt dangerous Seditions, and ſubverted whole States. It is no Wonder then, that the Government ſhould be very jealous of ſuch Enthuſiaſts, and think it neceſſary to proceed againſt them with great Severity, for Reaſons of civil Policy.

But why all this Outcry againſt *Perſecution?* Surely there was never leſs Reaſon to complain, or be afraid, of it. Never were Diſſenters of all Kinds treated with greater Lenity. [t] The *Church of England* ſets not up herſelf as *Lord over the Faith, and Conſciences of others*; nor does ſhe *dictate, or preſcribe, to others what they are to believe*. She claims only a Right to declare her own Terms of Communion, a Right, which every petty Society lays Claim to, and to judge of the Qualifications to be

[t] P. 163.

required of her own Miniſters, a Power eſſential to the very Being of a Church. Thoſe who cannot comply with theſe Terms have free Liberty to worſhip *God* in what Manner they pleaſe. Mr. *L.* himſelf, who exclaims againſt this *Monſter of human Authority*, has ([u] as an ingenious Writer has obſerved before me) Reaſon to acknowlege that our Church is no very fierce *Monſter*. If theſe *Unitarians* ſhould ever gain an Eſtabliſhment (which I truſt they never will) I very much doubt whether we ſhould meet with the like Indulgence. In the laſt Century, when the *Sectaries* got the upper Hand, they treated the Members of the *Church of England* with greater Severity, than they themſelves had felt in the Days of A-Bp *Laud*. We have ſeen that of old *Conſtantius*, and *Valens*, and after them the *Goths* and *Vandals*, grievouſly perſecuted the Church of *God*. We have ſeen too that in later Times the *Socinians* proceeded with great Rigour againſt *Davides*, and his Adherents. And I fear, if theſe *complete Unitarians* ſhould prevail, they would not want Pretence from *Scripture* to prohibit what they muſt call *Idolatry*, and perhaps extirpate all thoſe *who ſerved other Gods*.

[u] *Layman*'s Script. Confut. P. 217.

Far

Far be it from me to desire to persecute them, or injure them in the least, in their Persons, or Possessions: but surely we may exclude them from our *Communion*, and much more from our *Ministry*, without any Breach of Charity, How can there be any Communion between Persons of Sentiments so diametrically opposite? how can they join in Worship, who have not the same Object of Worship? If Persons of these Principles petition for Relief, and call upon us to repeal our *Articles*, and new model our *Liturgy*, I humbly think they merit very little Regard.

THE END.

As I was unwilling to swell this Pamphlet with Quotations at length from the Original, I have here added the Editions of the antient AUTHORS herein cited.

Clemens Romanus
Ignatius
Polycarp
Conſtitut. Apoſtol. } per Cotelerium 1724.

Juſtin Martyr
Athenagoras } Par. 1615.
Theophilus

Irenæus per Grabe, Oxon. 1702.
Clemens Alex. per Sylburg. Par. 1629.
Tertullian
Novatian } per Pamel. Rotomag. 1662.
Hippolytus per Fabricium, Hamburgh, 1716.
Cyprian per Fell, Oxon. 1682.
Origen Opera, per Huet. 1668.
——— contra Celſ. Cantab. 1658.
——— De Oratione, Oxon. 1686.
Arnobius, Hannov. 1603.
Lactantius, Lugdun. 1548.
Euſebius, &c. Eccleſ. Hiſt. per Valeſ. Par. 1678.
Philo Judæus, Par. 1640.
Baſilius, Par. 1638.
Chryſoſtom per Savil. Eton. 1612.
Auguſtinus Hipp. Baſ. per Froben. 1569.
Epiphanius, Par. 1622.
Sulpitius Severus, Lugd. Bat. 1654.
Victor Vitenſis, Par. 1610.
Procopius de Bell. Vandal. Par. 1662.
Facundus, Par. 1679.
Thuanus Hiſt. Aurel. 1620.
Sleidan Hiſt. tranſ. by Bohun, 1689.
Pearſon on the Creed, Fol. Lond. 1715.
Prideaux Connect. Fol. Lond. 1718.
Bingham Antiquities, Fol. Lond. 1726.
Moſheim Eccl. Hiſt. tranſ. by Macklane, Lond. 1765.

Lately printed by J. and J. FLETCHER, in the Turle, Oxford;

THE Reaſonableneſs of requiring Subſcription to Articles of Religion from Perſons to be admitted in Holy Orders, or a Cure of Souls, vindicated in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceſe of Oxford, in the Year 1771.

The Certainty of a Future State aſſerted and vindicated againſt the Exceptions of the late Lord Bolingbroke. —— A Sermon preached before the Univerſity of Oxford.

An Anſwer to a Pamphlet, entitled, Reflections on the Impropriety of Lay-Subſcription to the 39 Articles, in the Univerſity of Oxford. Addreſſed to the Author.

An Anſwer to a Pamphlet, entitled, Conſiderations on the Propriety of requiring a Subſcription to Articles of Faith.

The Excellency of the Jewiſh Law conſidered. In Two Sermons preached before the Univerſity of Oxford. To which is added an Appendix: And alſo a ſhort Comment on Pſalm CIX. and LV. wherein they are ſhewn not to be Imprecatory but Prophetical.

Chriſt the Lord of Glory. —— A Sermon before the Univerſity of Oxford, with Additions, confirming and enforcing the Doctrine.

The Uſe of Reaſon in Matters of Religion ſtated and explained. —— A Sermon before the Univerſity of Oxford.

Jephtha's Vow conſidered. —— A Sermon before the Univerſity of Oxford. With an Appendix, &c.

The Witneſs of the Spirit —— A Sermon before the Univerſity of Oxford.

The Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, explained in a Sermon before the Univerſity of Oxford.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, from the Exceptions of a late Pamphlet, entitled, an Eſſay on Spirit, in three Parts, with an Appendix.

*** The above are all by the Rev. THOMAS RANDOLPH, D. D. Preſident of C. C. C. Lady Margaret's Profeſſor of Divinity, and Archdeacon of Oxford.

A

SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION

OF THE

ARGUMENTS

AGAINST THE

ONE GODHEAD

OF THE

FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST,

PRODUCED BY

The Reverend Mr. LINDSEY

In his late APOLOGY.

By WILLIAM BURGH, Esq.

THE SECOND EDITION.

OMNES AD SACRAS LITERAS SUNT DUCENDI, UT INDE TALIA HAURIANT, QUÆ, NISI DEO SEMET PATEFACIENTE, COGNOSCI NEQUEUNT.

GROTIUS.

YORK:

Printed by A. WARD, for the AUTHOR, and sold by W. NICOLL, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, London; and by all Bookfellers in Town and Country.

MDCCLXXV.

[PRICE THREE SHILLINGS.]

to draw their own inferences, without being diſtracted by the intervention of ſuch as are altogether foreign to the ſubject. I have gone yet farther, and, reaſoning on the principles I had ſet down, have ſupplied them with ſuch arguments as were amply ſufficient to my own conviction; and which, had I not believed them to be ſufficient to theirs, I never ſhould have given to the world.

But, as I was new, both to that world, and myſelf as an author, it was natural in me to wiſh to obtain its ſentiments as ſpeedily as poſſible. To this purpoſe (which was all that an anonymous writer could do) I directed my printer to preſent copies of my book to a ſelect number of perſons, who might reaſonably be ſuppoſed to lead the ſentiments of the public: Perſons on whom, either an exalted ſtation, or ſomething better than an exalted ſtation had conferred conſequence. I flattered myſelf that I ſhould the more readily learn their opinion of my work, (if a favourable one) by taking this method of ſoliciting their peruſal of it. I was not diſappointed; for though I have not much to boaſt of any approbation perſonally addreſſed to myſelf, from thoſe who have drawn their honours from the royal fountain, yet I was not unnoticed by others, who derive theirs from the clear and unpolluted ſpring of merit. Amongſt the firſt of theſe, Sir, I was favour-

ed

ed with your ſentiments, delivered to me thro' the medium of my bookſeller's conveyance, in the ſpeedieſt and moſt polite manner. Let then a Layman, writing on a moſt important religious ſubject, make his boaſt, that he can, at leaſt, produce credentials in his favour from a layman, and that layman Mr. Edmund Burke.

To have found an ally in a perſon who had himſelf maintained the eſtabliſhment of the church; who, as a friend to truth, and as an inveſtigating Chriſtian, had already ſo ably, ſo eloquently, ſo zealouſly combated in her cauſe, muſt, in any ſituation, have been a pleaſing circumſtance. In mine it was much more; for when I perceived myſelf abetted by your favourable judgement, it gave me the fulleſt reaſon to hope, that my well-meant endeavours, to ſatisfy the ſcruples of men, who object upon one particular ground, would be attended with ſucceſs; eſpecially as I might now take the liberty of inſcribing that work to you, from whoſe approbation alone it could derive the confidence to claim your patronage.

When I have thus made it known to the world that you have borne me a favourable teſtimony, I may add, that I republiſh with a certainty of being uſeful. I may indeed conſider myſelf as having anſwered Mr. Lindſey's book in a manner originally foreign from my intention,

intention, and thrown a weight into the oppoſite ſcale, ſufficient to preponderate againſt his huge maſs of human authority. I have the honour to be,

Sir,

With the greateſt reſpect and eſteem,

Your much obliged,

And moſt obedient, humble ſervant,

WILLIAM BURGH.

Advertiſement.

IN the following ſheets, which I am deſirous of rendering univerſally uſeful, I have taken care to write the third and fourth chapters in ſuch a manner, as that they may be read ſeparately by perſons to whom the preceding part of the work might be difficult or unneceſſary.—The plan I have purſued throughout is as follows.——Having, as I think, ſet aſide Mr. Lindſey's foundation of argument in the introduction, and ſhewed the fallacy or inconcluſiveneſs of what he builds moſt upon, I have in my firſt chapter ſtated the proper premiſes upon which our reaſon is at liberty to act with reſpect to ſcripture truths. In my ſecond, I have endeavoured to ſhew the nature of the evidence which is borne to that great ſcripture truth to which our faith is required. And in the ſubſequent parts of the work have ſhewed what the evidence itſelf is.— I have but one requeſt to make of my reader, which is, that he will do by me as I did by Mr. Lindſey; and when he is reading my book, that he will place the

Bible beſide him; for, by my agreement, with that only do I deſire to ſtand; nay, if I ſhall be found to diſagree, I wiſh to fall. In ſome few inſtances, for the ſake of continuing a ſentence, I have changed the perſon uſed in a ſcripture precept, and, inſtead of abſolutely adhering to ſuch words as *do ye*, have ſometimes ſaid *we are deſired to do*, &c. and in a few inſtances have omitted a multitude of nominatives, where one anſwered the purpoſe full as well, as in Rev. vi. 15, 16, where it is ſaid that *the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond man, and every free man hid themſelves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains*; in ſuch caſes I have uſed only the firſt. Of this I think it neceſſary to apprize my reader, leſt he ſhould charge me with inaccuracy in my quotations; whereas I will promiſe him that, throughout the whole work, he will not find the ſmalleſt alteration made in the ſenſe. The paſſages with which I have taken this liberty are but very few alſo; but let him lay the Bible before him, and there is no great danger of his being miſled.—— Sometimes inſtead of quoting I have paraphraſed;

phraſed; but that will always appear in the inſtance. — In the 66th page I have made a comment upon John viii. 58, and confuted an objection brought againſt it by an author who ſtyles himſelf "a Lover of the Goſpel." The paſſage which I have treated of was pointed out to me; it remained on my mind, and by miſtake I have aſcribed it to Mr. Lindſey. This is but of ſmall importance. I mention it only that I may apologize to him for it.

A

SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

THE conduct of Mr. Lindsey, in resigning the vicarage of Catterick on certain scruples, excited my curiosity to know what his particular objections to the subscription of the articles of the church of England were. His resignation was soon followed by a book under the captivating title of "The Apology of Theophilus Lindsey, A. M. on resigning the vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire." With this book, which was gre edilybought up, I also furnished myself. What I expected to have found in it, is of no consequence to the public; but I did indeed find a much "larger circuit taken" than the title promised, and that "the design was not barely to offer a vindication of the motives and conduct of a private person," but to assail every fundamental doctrine of the church, from the ministry of which he had retired; to degrade the God of our salvation; to snatch from us the object of our religion; and to evince, that Jesus Christ is not one, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, God. Upon what foundation he has raised the flimsy superstructure of his own doctrine, or rather with what engines he has endeavoured to subvert the fixed fabrick of our religion, and force it from the basis of revelation, I shall proceed to shew; and without insi-

A nuating

nuating pretenſions to divine aſſiſtance, from the grant of which it might be inferred, that my cauſe had the particular favour of heaven, I hope to evince the divinity of our bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and, in oppoſition to all the human authority convened by Mr. Lindſey, to ſhew that God himſelf has borne teſtimony to it; and if, from his revelation, it be clearly ſet forth that Jeſus Chriſt is both God and man, I hope and believe the poſition will be acceded to, however unable reaſon may be to comprehend it, or how numerous ſoever the voices may be which have lifted themſelves up againſt it.

Before I enter upon the ſubject propoſed, I think it neceſſary to remove ſome prejudices which favour Mr. Lindſey's cauſe, prejudices ſo natural to the mind of man, that he has been aware of their uſe, and, with ſuperfluous diligence, beſtowed near half his book to inſtill them. The influence of theſe upon my readers I muſt, however, try to avert before I can hope for an impartial hearing; for I have reſigned no vicarage; I have puſhed from me no worldly advantages; I have given no proofs that a little, with a ſettled conſcience, is preferable, in my eyes, to great riches retained by acquieſcence in that which I do not believe; all of which he has done, and for which let me freely pay him the tribute of my praiſe; let me declare that I honour the ſincerity which ſuch a conduct demoſtrates; but let me never ſay that, from the rectitude of his heart, I can deduce the rectitude of his opinions. Such proofs of my ſincerity, it is true, I have it not in my power to produce; but even Mr. Lindſey has borne ſuch teſtimony to the troubles of an unquiet ſpirit, that no man will conceive that I ſhould ſeek to incur them by a voluntary engagement in the cauſe of falſehood, or look upon the ſalvation of my immortal ſoul as a matter of

ſo

ſo little importance to me, that I ſhould maintain a doctrine, connected as this is with the felicity of a future ſtate, if I were not clearly convinced of its truth.

Unleſs then I am to conſider it written with a view to prejudice the Reader, the aim of the long chapter of ſufferers for the maintenance of Mr. Lindſey's doctrine is altogether inexplicable to me, becauſe I am unable to deduce the truth of a ſyſtem from any other ſource than that of reaſon or fair argument. Submiſſion to miſery, in preference to the conceſſion of an opinion, does indeed prove the ſincerity of the ſufferer, but by no means the opinion for which he has ſuffered; it may prove the weakneſs of his underſtanding, but by no means the ſtrength of his cauſe. In India the diſtortions of the Bramin are the teſtimony of the divinity of his Ixora; in the holy office, the ſubmiſſion of the Jew to the extremeſt tortures, is the teſtimony that our Saviour had not even divine aſſiſtance; and now in England we find a number of unhappy wretches ſuffering under equally unjuſt and cruel inflictions, to prove a negation of our Saviour's divinity; and this liſt of miſerable creatures is held out to the public by a gentleman who has voluntarily added himſelf to the number. I have already ſaid that I conſidered ſuch a conduct as a proof of ſincerity, but I cannot ſubmit to allow it the name of martyrdom, or in the leaſt degree a proof of the juſtice or truth of the opinion for the maintenance of which it is ſuſtained; doctrines the moſt contradictory would elſe be true. Papal ſupremacy and regal ſupremacy have almoſt mingled their blazing teſtimonies, and were they both truly to be maintained? What horrible proofs have been given to the world that flour and water are fleſh and blood; and will any man declare that the contrary doctrine has derived validity from equal, nay greater, ſtreams of blood

poured out to teſtify that they were flour and water ſtill? No man, ſurely; becauſe this is a poſition, the proofs of which are ſubmitted to all men, and a ſtronger degree of teſtimony, than my ſtedfaſtneſs, may be and is borne to it by the ſenſes of all mankind. Both ſides of this queſtion have had their bleeding advocates, and are they therefore both true? I will go yet farther and ſay, that were I to undergo the ſharpeſt afflictions for entertaining the oppoſite doctrine to that of Mr. Lindſey, (and I would undergo them rather than depart from the belief for which I think I have ſo ſufficient grounds) yet I ſhould not conceive that I had added even the ſlighteſt proof of the truth of it. My ſincerity the world would, I believe, allow, but what could my ſincerity evince? I ſuffer for a poſition, and becauſe I have believed it upon arguments ſeeming ſufficient to me; if they be in fact ſufficient, I have done well to adhere to them, and they were as valid before my ſuffering as afterwards; and if they are defective, my miſeries cannot alter the concluſions following from them. Their truth or falſehood, the juſtice or injuſtice of the inference are pre-exiſtent to my teſtimony, and ſo abſolutely independent of my belief, or any proofs that I may give of the ſincerity of my belief, and are ſo far from deriving ſtrength from my ſuffering in behalf of them, that they would have been preciſely the ſame though I had never been born, as if I had made my exit at a ſtake. I am anxious to eſtabliſh this point, and therefore dwell upon it, for I fear that too eaſy credit may be yielded to a doctrine held forth by a claimant to martyrdom; the ſeal of blood has given a ſeeming validity to many a poſition, from which the aſſertors had before derived no glory; the ſtake, where it has been the only argument, has ſometimes been conſidered as a very convincing one; and a departure in flames has been thought to have revealed

vealed the angel, where the precepts for which they are ſuſtained had perhaps only ſhewed forth the contemptible man: But martyrdom is not now to be deduced from ſincerity, which is all that can be concluded from ſtrenuous ſuffering. The apoſtles indeed were martyrs, they bore teſtimony to facts ſubmitted to their ſenſes, and had even a ſenſible perception of divine aſſiſtance, of which alſo they gave proofs to the world: They bore teſtimony, and they would not recede from it; what they teſtified they knew, and promulgated by extraordinary aid, of which they were eminently conſcious; what they knew, not what opinions they formed without divine aſſiſtance, was their doctrine; and from the teſtimony of what they knew they would not be deterred; they ſuffered, and their conſtancy was a proof of their ſincerity: But they were ſincere, not in the maintenance of dubious controvertible doctrines, but in having teſtified, that what they had preached they had known. As then they were ſincere, and had proved themſelves ſo, we muſt conclude that they did know what they had preached, and conſider their ſtedfaſt adherence to what they had ſet out with as an exceedingly ſtrong teſtimony borne to the truth of it; and ſuch a teſtimony as this is what is properly called martyrdom. I hope that this may be ſufficient to warn my readers from looking upon ſincerity as a proof of the opinion ſincerely believed; let it recommend the heart, but by no means the head, the errors of which may be as ſincerely believed as the beſt eſtabliſhed maxims.

The prodigious number of names, only pretending to human authority, which are produced by Mr. Lindſey to ſupport his doctrines, might perhaps be well oppoſed by citing as great a multitude of eminent men, who have agreed with the church of England, and aſcribed divinity to our bleſſed Saviour. Were it only to ſatisfy

ſatisfy him, with whom, I fear, the authority of the ſcriptures will ſignify but little, I would purſue this courſe of argument (if argument it may be called); but I ſcorn any other foundation than that of God himſelf, whoſe written word, not ſeen through the medium of a comment, is alone evidence to me; let it not therefore be inferred, that I am unable to meet him upon his own ground, becauſe I chooſe that which is better; for I could, to him, oppoſe as good human authority to maintain my belief as any ten Dutch women in Europe, however ſtrenuouſly they might have ſuſtained and ſuffered for the doctrines of Anabaptiſm.

The diſpoſitions of mankind lean toward thoſe who flatter their reaſon, and endeavour to reduce all things to her comprehenſion, or to thoſe who abet that pride with which ſhe is deſirous of rejecting whatſoever ſhe cannot comprehend; from this principle it is that they who familiarly illuſtrate the moſt unfamiliar difficulties, or flatly deny the exiſtence of that which tranſcends the faculties of man, are heard with partial ears. Againſt this prejudice alſo, in favour of Mr. Lindſey, I am obliged to guard; for he has declared, that "our Saviour Chriſt teacheth no myſterious doctrines". As I have already ſaid, that the ſcriptures ſhall be my only appeal; to this denial of a myſtery, nay to that ridicule with which the word *Myſtery* is treated throughout Mr. Lindſey's book, I ſhall oppoſe the ſerious declaration of St. Paul, who, ſpeaking of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt and him crucified, and that not with enticing words of Man's wiſdom, but in demonſtration of the Spirit, that our faith might ſtand not in the wiſdom of man, but the power of God, declares, "we ſpeak the wiſdom of God in a myſtery"; and this he ſays he does "by the Spirit of God, by which alone the deep things of God are ſearched"; and he farther declares,

that

that "the ſpirit compares ſpiritual things with ſpiritual; but that theſe things are fooliſhneſs to the natural man who receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." See 1 Cor. ii.

Will Mr. Lindſey now perſevere to ſay, that the doctrine of Chriſt is not myſterious? The moral doctrines delivered by himſelf I grant, indeed, are not ſo; but on the contrary moſt perſpicuouſly clear; but a manifeſtation of him who delivered thoſe doctrines, and a revelation teſtifying of him, and ſetting forth who he was, and is, and ſhall eternally be, and that "in him dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily," Coloſſ. ii .9. Is not this a myſtery? "Now, without controverſy, great is the myſtery of godlineſs; God was made manifeſt in the fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory," 1 Tim. iii. 16. Let us then beware of the philoſophy of the natural man, of the enticing words of man's wiſdom, which St. Paul has warned us againſt, becauſe he well foreſaw that it would ſtand in the way and preclude "the acknowledgment of the myſtery of God, and of the Father, and of Chriſt," Coloſſ. ii. 2. This warning to beware of the deceits of philoſophy is given at ſuch a time, and in context with ſuch a doctrine, as makes it utterly aſtoniſhing to me how any man in his ſenſes ſhould attempt to warp it to the purpoſes of overturning our Saviour's divinity: We are deſired to beware of it, becauſe it might be oppoſite to the declaration which immediately follows, that "in Chriſt dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily;" that "Chriſt is all in all;" that "Chriſt forgave us all;" that "of the Lord we ſhall receive the reward of the inheritance, for we ſerve the Lord Chriſt;" that "whatſoever we do, we ſhould do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto man."

man." In ſhort, St. Paul has given us this warning in the midſt of his epiſtle to the Coloſſians, to which I refer as a moſt explicit declaration of our Saviour's divinity throughout. Let us juſt conſider now, whether this warning can have any other object in view. Mr. Lindſey's principal objection to the Godhead of Chriſt, is, that it is not reconcilable to reaſon; St. Paul ſays, that the Greek requires wiſdom. Mr. Lindſey ſays, that it is a doctrine fraught not only with impiety but abſurdity; St. Paul ſays, that it is to the Greek fooliſhneſs. Of what doctrines, of what philoſophy now was St. Paul afraid? Will Mr. Lindſey ſay, that he feared that the Greeks would, from their demand for a reaſonable doctrine, adopt a doctrine contrary to what he thinks reaſonable himſelf? Or will he ſay that the apoſtle apprehended, from their averſion to that which was fooliſh, their adoption of a doctrine which he himſelf declares to be fooliſh? If this be his mode of reaſoning, it is ſo ſelf-ſubverted that it requires only to be read for its own confutation. His aſſertion, that the Trinity is an idea adopted from Plato, is full of impiety, and ſo extreamly weak, that I am ſorry to ſee any man capable of promulgating it; and, were I not aſſured of this gentleman's ſincerity, from the proof which he has given to the world, that upon the whole he diſbelieves our Saviour's divinity, I ſhould incline to conceive that he meant to impoſe this on mankind upon the faith of a martyr. I will now advance one of the like nature, and aſſure Mr. Lindſey that the idea of the Unity of God is derived from the philoſophy of Socrates, who, notwithſtanding his having been educated in a country where ſuch a doctrine was eſteemed impious, yet dared to preach this imagination of his own brain. How does this ſound? Juſt as well as the other, and is advanced with fully equal truth. For my own part, I muſt now declare to this gentleman, that (ſo far from having

having drawn my faith in the Trinity from Plato, the only book I have ever read on the ſubject, (except his own, which I was led to look into by my curioſity to ſee the motives of his uncommonly conſcientious conduct) is the Bible. That I have thence deduced the doctrine of the Trinity; that both the Old and the New Teſtaments evince it; the Old by typical and verbal prophecies; and the New, by the events which juſtify the prophecies; that our Saviour's life and leſſons teach it; and that the more explicit teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt declare and enforce it; that, in the epiſtles of St. Paul, evaded or trifled with, it is delivered in nearly ſo many words. But I muſt farther declare, that though it be not preciſely ſo denominated there, or in any part of the ſcriptures, I cannot form an idea why I am not at liberty to give a name to that, which another ſhall ſo deſcribe as to put it into my power to give it a name for the benefit of communication. The Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, is a doctrine which I deduce from the ſacred writings, and to theſe three perſons I am ſurely at liberty to give a name that ſhall at once comprehend them all, and ſerve the purpoſe of more expeditiouſly conveying my mind on the ſubject, whenſoever I ſhall fall upon it, without levity. From the ſame ſource alſo I deduce the being of but one God; and as I have before given the name of Trinity to the three Perſons, to this Godhead I give the name of Trinity in Unity; and what ſhall preclude my giving a name where the ſcriptures have given the ſubſtance, I own I do not ſee; nor can I conceive this objection to the Trinity of perſons, and the Unity of the Godhead, to be a bit better grounded than that of the Quakers to the uſe of the word *you*, becauſe the term is not to be found in the Bible. It is objected alſo to the doctrine of the Trinity, that the word was not formed till

late in the ſecond century. As to the date of a word I cannot ſee it to be of any ſort of conſequence, if the idea to which it is annexed be but conveyed by it. If we had not been termed Chriſtians by the people of Antioch, and that the profeſſors of Chriſt's religion had, as yet, continued without a name, would poſterity deny the exiſtence of Chriſtianity, or diſpute the propriety of the term, becauſe it was of the eighteenth century? The word *Chriſtians* was equally applicable to us before we were called by it at Antioch, as after; and the word *Trinity* was equally applicable to the three perſons of the Godhead before mankind agreed to call them by it, as after.

But if the name only were in debate, I ſhould be but very little concerned about it, the Unity of the Godhead, and the Divinity of the three Perſons being allowed, I care not by what appellation they are called: But I am ſorry to ſee, at a time when I believe the *doctrine* is what Mr. Lindſey would confute, that he is weak enough to conceive that a diſapprobation of the *name* will in the leaſt contribute to his purpoſe; for either he muſt conceive that it does, and ſo trifle; or not conceiving ſo, acknowledge that he is talking about words only; and ſurely nothing can be more uncandid than ſuch a proceſs. He muſt aſſuredly know that his delicate conduct will procure him more readers than he could with modeſty have hoped for, had his book been put forth without ſuch a concomitant circumſtance; and alſo that, in the multitude of his readers, underſtandings of every ſize muſt be numbered; and it is therefore impoſſible but he muſt have foreſeen that ſome will be of ſo contracted dimenſions, as to reckon the diſlike of the word among the arguments againſt the ſubſtance named. To what purpoſe elſe than that of deception is it advanced, that to Luther "the word

Trinity

Trinity ſounds oddly, and is of human invention, and that it were better to call Almighty God, God, than Trinity." And that Calvin ſays "I like not this prayer, O holy, bleſſed, and glorious Trinity, it ſavours of barbariſm." Are Luther and Calvin among the opponents of the doctrine of the Trinity? No ſuch thing; and Mr. Lindſey himſelf ſhall tell you that they were well known and warm contenders for what is called the doctrine of the Trinity, though they expreſſed ſuch a diſlike of the word itſelf. I cannot ſee his inference, unleſs he would inſinuate that a diſlike of the word, is a diſlike of the doctrine, and therefore avail himſelf of the authority of theſe "virtuous holy" men: But that authority is altogether againſt him, as himſelf acknowledges; and Calvin, by a horrible inſtance, proved the ſincerity of his belief in the Trinity, for he actually brought Servetus to the ſtake for oppoſing it.

If this delicacy of Calvin, concerning the barbariſm of a term, be admitted in argument, I ſee no reaſon wherefore we ſhould reject a claſſic mythology; or why, when we ſpeak of our Saviour's incarnation, we ſhould not uſe the words with which Eraſmus ridiculed the faſtidious wits of Leo's poliſhed court, and ſay, "E cœlo deſcendit filius Jovis." In ſhort, I can ſee no reaſon wherefore we ſhould not, like Leo himſelf, paſs judgment upon the whole of the ſacred writings, declare them barbarous, and never read the Bible for fear of ſpoiling our taſte. And with reſpect to what is ſaid concerning Luther, however it may be aſſerted that he prefers the calling upon God, by the name of God, to the calling upon him by the name Trinity, it is deducible from this aſſertion, that he looked upon the two words as ſynonimous, and conſequently that the word *Trinity*, though it might ſound oddly, was expreſſive of the idea, which he chooſes rather to expreſs by the

term God; a term perhaps more pleasing to his ear.

Thus far I have written, not with a view of derogating from the real worth of Mr. Lindsey, nor of lessening the value of such worth in the eyes of mankind; but with a purpose of preventing the merits of the honest conscientious man being carried over to his cause, and concluded to be the merits of his argument. I am myself desirous that the favour which is due to his virtue should attend his person, but not be converted into partiality for his cause. I seek not to obtain the favour of the public to myself, but their unprejudiced ear, and that men should yield their convictions to truth only, and not take prepossessions for conviction. Preliminaries being, I hope, settled, I shall now no longer withhold my reader from that line of argument, by which alone it seems to me possible to inquire into the subject before us, and by the pursuit of which, I trust, I shall be able to evince the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

CHAP. I.

On the Province of Reaſon, with Reſpect to its Enquiry into Scripture Truths.

MR. Lindſey commences with an aſſertion, that "the unlearned reader ſees at once, that the God who made him, and whom he is to adore, is one, without multiplicity or diviſion, even as he knoweth himſelf to be one, being one perſon and not many;" and on this poſition he proceeds to argue. If Mr. Lindſey means by the unlearned reader, the reader of his book, who has never read the Bible, perhaps he is right; but I believe that every reader, who has read the Bible, will ſee the fallacy of this great foundation of all that follows in confutation of a trinity of Perſons in the Godhead. On a ſuppoſition that nature has ſuggeſted, and philoſophy refined upon the ſuggeſtion of a God, I do not doubt that natural religion might acquieſce in this aſſertion; but are we to come to the ſcriptures, which all men allow to be the foundation of our religion, with a religion already formed, and to judge of the revelation made by the God of truth, according to its correſpondence with our previous perſuaſions? Are we to exalt our own reaſon, and ſay, that it is a ſtandard whereby to meaſure the infinite extents of power and wiſdom? or are we to ſet bounds to infinity, and annihilate all that ſtretches beyond the graſp of our limited comprehenſion? The ſhort-ſighted man may, with equal truth, and equal wiſdom, deny the exiſtence of all objects beyond the reach of his viſion. And yet one of theſe conſequences muſt be inferred from the aſſertion, either that our reaſon is infi-

nite

nite to measure infinite wisdom; or that the wisdom of God is finite, and narrowly limited, in order to be conformable to our reason; for the faculty must be commensurate to the object, before it can take it into observation and determine upon it.

I should be sorry to have it understood, that I wish to set up one boundary which original nature has suffered reason to pass. I think, however, that, as there are boundaries already formed, beyond which she is not permitted to expatiate, it is an object of consequence to mankind to find where they are fixed; for, by an acquaintance with our limits, we shall also possess a definite idea of that which is within our comprehension; and so, instead of idly squandering our useful hours in pursuit of knowledge that is too high for us, and which, when we conceive that we have attained unto it, terminates not in conclusion, but at the very best in specious fallacy, we shall turn the force of our faculties against objects which must yield to our vigorous exertions, atchieve that which, retained, may be serviceable to ourselves, or, communicated, prove beneficial to our fellow creatures.

My purpose is only to inquire into those limits by which reason is circumscribed with regard to scripture truths, and into the proper conduct of reason within those limits.

By the word *Reason*, I mean that faculty of the mind by which it perceives the relative qualities of the objects of our perception; by which it compares the objects of our perception; and, upon comparison, sees the conclusions, of whatsoever nature they be, which result.

The

The word *Compariſon* I uſe in an extenſive ſenſe, for every manner of laying together the relative qualities in order to infer; and I chooſe to ſay, that reaſon ſees rather than forms the concluſions, becauſe I ſuppoſe them to have been formed, and exiſting at all times, whether obſerved or not, and no more to be annihilated by my withdrawing my obſervation, than Mr. Hume is by my blowing out the candle, by the light of which I had (according to his own philoſophy) ſeen him into exiſtence.

That great truth of Scripture which I wiſh to hold forth for the aſſent of mankind, and which I wiſh alſo to preſcribe and purſue a proper manner of inquiring into, is, that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, God.

It has often been aſſerted, that reaſon abſolutely contradicted the poſſibility of ſuch a union of divine perfection and human imperfection, and thence the impoſſibility of ſuch a union is inferred, and the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt denied upon this unweighed aſſertion; whereas, were it conſidered, that the relative qualities of God and of Man are the objects of compariſon, and that the incompatibility of theſe two natures, upon a perception of the qualities of each, muſt be ſeen from the compariſon, perhaps men who deny our Saviour's divinity would heſitate a moment before they would even pronounce that their reaſon had, upon natural premiſes, given any teſtimony whatſoever concerning him; for, in the proceſs, it muſt be enquired into, whether the objects of the compariſon be really the objects of their perception, how far even the nature of man is within their comprehenſion, and how far the nature of God is beyond it; and if, upon enquiry, it be found, that the relative qualities of the two natures are altogether unknown, reaſon muſt be declared incompetent

competept to make a compariſon, and conſequently to ſee any concluſion whatſoever. Reaſon, therefore, can never have denied, that Jeſus Chriſt is both God and Man, however ignorance and preſumption may, under her reſpectable name.

I do not deſire, on the other hand, to conclude a belief in ſcripture truths from the unaſſiſted light of reaſon; I only deſire to put that religion, which we may imagine nature has found by that light, out of the queſtion; and then firſt to call for the obſervation of reaſon, when maxims, whence argument may proceed, are eſtabliſhed; when we firſt find objects which we may compare, and from the compariſon of which we may conclude: But till ſuch are found, and agreed upon, we muſt walk upon uncertain ground; and if we ſhould happen to come right in the end, it muſt be by ways of which we could not have been certain while on our progreſs. To fabricate maxims is not the office of reaſon, but to obſerve upon ſuch as are ready made and ſubmitted to her cognizance, I therefore aſk no aid to my cauſe from any ſuggeſtions that ſhe may be ſuppoſed to have made, nor will I allow that ſhe can have afforded any to infidelity. I wiſh only to diſſuade from looking upon a negative as proved, becauſe the affirmative does not follow from premiſes not cognizable: From ſuch premiſes we never can argue to any concluſion whatſoever; for no relation being viſible, no reſult can iſſue. A declaration from natural religion that God is omnipotent and all-wiſe, can by no means ſet aſide a declaration that he has done that which to us may appear weak and fooliſh; we muſt be competent to judge of infinite power and infinite wiſdom before we can compare the act with the agency; and we muſt be very ſure that the act which is inconſiſtent with our degree of wiſdom, muſt be inconſiſtent with a greater height than our own, before

before we can pronounce that it is impoſſible for infinite wiſdom to ſee a reaſon for ſo acting. Even in the courſe of worldly tranſactions, how often has a man of ſenſe accounted for imputed abſurdity of conduct, and, by ſhewing us the grounds of his action, extorted our applauſe where we had before been too liberal of our cenſure? The reaſons which influence man are intelligible to man, and therefore, when aſſigned, may indemnify his act; but the reaſons of the conduct of our infinite Maker muſt be incommunicable, becauſe unintelligible to our faculties, unleſs our minds were enlightened above our ſphere; that is, unleſs mankind were placed higher in the chain of intellectual beings, which ſomewhere requires the exiſtence of ſuch a creature, and ſo ſhould not be man. We cannot then argue, from any idea we are able to form of any attribute of God, to the action properly proceeding from it; and therefore can never deny an act, by himſelf aſcribed to any of his attributes. Has infinite mercy let looſe the bloody tyrant to ſcourge mankind? Or does infinite juſtice chooſe to afflict the meek and benevolent heart? Can the aſſumption of fleſh, and ſubjection to the infirmities of man, be imputed to the wiſdom of God? Or does infinite power and glory beam from a helpleſs bleeding body hanging on a croſs? And yet as reaſonably may theſe two latter inſtances of impotence and folly be aſcribed to infinite extents of power and wiſdom, as the two former, the proſperity of the wicked, and the broken heart of the benevolent, to the infinite extents of mercy and juſtice. If then the conduct of the affairs of this world be not reconcilable to our ideas of infinite faculties, we muſt, if we interpret from the act to the agent, diſprove the exiſtence of thoſe attributes with which we cannot reconcile ſuch conduct, and conſequently the exiſtence of the being in which we had before conceived them inherent; ſo that returning to God by the ſame road by which we deſcended from

him, we no more find him, and the infinitely great Creator of all things we then diſcover to have been a meer Creature of our own imaginations.

Such is the proceſs of unconducted reaſon: With the ſame arguments ſhe conceives and annihilates her God: At every turn ſhe finds and loſes him, yet ſtill regrets the loſs, and though ſhe cannot maintain the poſſeſſion, relinquiſhes it with reluctance. If from our longing after immortality, our immortality is to be concluded, from our longing after an acquaintance with an intimated God, we may likewiſe infer the reaſonableneſs of a revelation admitting us to that acquaintance, and helping us to a permanent idea, which nature was never enabled to acquire of herſelf. It ſeems then an act conſiſtent with our previous perſuaſions, in which even reaſon acquieſces, that a God, endowed with benignity, ſhould ſtretch forth his hand to mankind thus wandering in eternal intricacies, mercifully vouchſafe himſelf to become his guide, lead him to truth, and make his own way ſtrait before him. This mode of argument, however, I do not inſiſt upon, I make uſe of it rather to illuſtrate than infer. I can do without any conceſſions from reaſon; for, at all events, I am certain, that, if ſhe does not affirm, ſhe cannot, upon the principles which I have already laid down, deny the conſiſtency of ſuch an act with the agent of whom it is ſuppoſed; but if the ſtrongeſt external teſtimony bear witneſs, that God has revealed himſelf, and that reaſon be incapable of producing any evidence to the contrary; nay, if a revelation be what reaſon might have herſelf preſcribed, and hoped as a guide to her own errors, wherefore ſhould we not acquieſce in it when related, and look upon it as a fact, that God has actually revealed himſelf? The nature and validity of the teſtimony, upon which the aſſertion is made, is extreamly well worth

enquiry,

enquiry, and certainly ſhould be inveſtigated by all who entertain any doubt of the fact aſſerted. For my own part, I am ſatisfied; and Mr. Lindſey has exempted me from the neceſſity of going into the enquiry here; having acknowledged that God has revealed himſelf, that the ſcriptures are his revelation, that they afford "an evidence which no fair mind can reſiſt," and that they are "the only rule of faith and conſcience to Chriſtian men:" In all of which I perfectly and entirely agree with him. The credibility of God, whom all allow, and who has pronounced himſelf to be the God of truth, is a ground whereon to build our faith in whatſoever he ſhall relate of his own incomprehenſible majeſty; and, as I have ſaid before, that the conduct of God can never be meaſured by his attributes, ſo I now ſay, that there lies no appeal from his credibility, from his truth to the inſcrutable nature; we muſt acquieſce in that which he has ſaid; it muſt be; it is true.

Having admitted the ſcriptures to be the word of God, and that whatſoever is ſet forth in them is true, we are not yet to conceive that he has ſo far ſubmitted himſelf to our faculties as to enable us to draw any argument from him; for we are not yet to compare his conduct, as revealed therein, with God himſelf, nor to judge of the conſiſtency of any act therein declared to be his, with the infinite Agent ſtill left incomprehenſible; for to render him otherwiſe to us, the enlargement of our faculties muſt attend upon a revelation of all his glory, and therefore a revelation of all his glory is not to be required. Perhaps the diſtinction is not here ſo clearly marked as I could deſire, and that what I have laſt written may ſeem to be only a repetition of what immediately precedes it; it is not ſo; what I wiſh to inculcate is briefly this, that, as in natural religion, no compariſon can be had between the attributes of God,

and the moral evils of the world ſubmitted to our obſervation, and yet that we do not quite conſent to annihilate an original to nature, becauſe his government ſeems to argue againſt him; ſo we ſhould not, when revelation declares a courſe of conduct, which we cannot reconcile with the attributes aſcribed to him, any more deny that courſe of conduct, from its irreconcileableneſs with God, than we ſhould deny the exiſtence of moral evil, becauſe we had by nature pronounced that Original to be great, wiſe, and good: For if moral evil were incapable of rooting out the acknowledgment of the exiſtence of a cauſe ſupremely good; ſo a conduct, not underſtood to be wiſe, ſhould not be admitted an argument againſt the exiſtence of a revealed God; but we cannot deny the exiſtence of moral evil, and yet nature ſays there is a good God; wherefore then ſhould we conceive, that an acknowledgment of a conduct confeſſedly not underſtood, and therefore not to be reprehended, can militate againſt the acknowledgment of the God who has revealed himſelf? Let us then, if we admit a good cauſe conſiſtent with moral evil, not argue againſt the conſiſtency of an incomprehenſible God, and an unintelligible conduct: There may ſubſiſt an unſeen relation in this latter caſe; whereas an eventual evil, reſulting from a ſupreamly good cauſe, ſeems actually to contradict our reaſon. The purpoſe for which I have written this, is to put men upon their guard againſt any ſuggeſtion, that the revelation of God, made by himſelf, ſhould convey an adequate idea of his great glory. That it ſhould do ſo to man I have ſhewed to be impoſſible. It has indeed declared him infinite, but a declaration that God is infinite, is a declaration that he is incomprehenſible: An indefinite majeſty is all that can poſſibly be aſcribed to God; and, in the conduct of incomprehenſible wiſdom, it is not probable that much can occur exactly conformable to our faculties. If then,

even

even a revelation be unable to make him comprehended, we are ſtill to conſider him beyond the reach of reaſon; and when he relates his own actions, ſtill conceive that the agent is not cognizable, that he ſhould be compared with them. To make us better men upon hope grounded on his mercies, is the moſt beneficial purpoſe for which we can conceive it poſſible for God to reveal himſelf; and to this very purpoſe we find a revelation made, wherein that providence which extends to us is declared. To what end ſhould God lay before our eyes the government of all that we are not concerned in? That he has created and redeemed us, is a motive to gratitude and to brotherly love; it is ſufficient to ſhew in him a power to be feared for its extent, and adored for its beneficent exertion. To evince that he has promiſed to every man the reward of his works, and pointed out thoſe works which lead us to hope in him that is faithful, is a fully ſufficient motive to faith, hope, and charity; that he bears the relative ſuperiority of a creator over his creature, is a ſufficient motive to us to pronounce him our God, and aſcribe to him all honour and glory, without ſeeking for a farther revelation of the exertion of his infinite power, which we are not concerned to know. But in the government of the univerſe, it may be ſaid, he has ſelected this little orb, rolling through infinite ſpace, as a ſcene of a moſt wonderful tranſaction in which we are certainly concerned; for it is aſſerted that our ſalvation is the conſequence, and was the end propoſed; and are we not yet to comprehend him? By no means; the infinite wiſdom which dictated and knows wherefore ſuch a tranſaction is the fitteſt means of our ſalvation, has not yet ſubmitted itſelf to our inveſtigation, nor directly told us why this was the moſt adequate means to ſo beneficent an end; he ſtill remains incomprehenſible, and that tranſaction by which we are become partakers of eternal life, being revealed,

amounts

amounts only to a foundation and motive for us to rely upon God, and act according to his will thereby declared to us, and not to a diſplay of all that muſt neceſſarily exceed the limits of our perception. We are not called upon to account for his conduct; but we are required to love him, to hope and to truſt in him. A declaration of his power, and the exertion of ſo much of it as bears relation to us, is all then that was neceſſary for thoſe ends; theſe are beſt declared by a revelation of the conduct of God towards man. Such a revelation is made, and there is much in it that we cannot underſtand; and ſuch muſt ever be the caſe, for in whatſoever action we look upon, proceeding from a higher intellect than our own, we ſhall ſee ſomewhat not intelligible till the grounds of it are communicated. In whatſoever action of God, made perceptible to us, we look upon, we ſhall ſee ſomewhat which muſt eternally continue unintelligible; for it proceeds from infinite heights of intellect, and conſequently muſt be incommunicable.

Reaſon is, as it were, the eye of the mind; and as the eye is incapable of comparing inviſible things, or viſible with inviſible, ſo is reaſon incompetent to bring together objects not perceptible, or to compare that which it can perceive with that which is beyond her perception. A view into that which is inviſible, is not neceſſary to give exiſtence to that which the eye has ſeen; neither is the comprehenſibility of objects not perceptible, neceſſary to the exiſtence of that which is ſubmitted to the perception of reaſon.

Having, as I hope, now proved that there can ſubſiſt no viſible relation between the conduct of God and the uncomprehended God of natural religion, and therefore that reaſon cannot deny that he has revealed himſelf; and

and having farther ſhewed, upon the ſuppoſition that he has revealed himſelf, that it was neither neceſſary nor poſſible for him to render himſelf comprehenſible to our faculties; and therefore that his conduct, as revealed, cannot be brought into compariſon with himſelf, that it ſhould be denied of him by reaſon; we muſt come to this concluſion, that God is not an object of our perception, and conſequently his faculties are not a ground whence argument can proceed, that which is incomprehenſible not being to be brought to the teſt of reaſon, nor by her made a meaſure for any thing which may be aſſerted concerning them. About matters which we do not comprehend, it is obvious that we cannot with certainty ſay any thing. The incomprehenſible attributes of God then are not fit premiſes, no concluſion poſſibly following, from any compariſon of them with whatſoever may be revealed to have been effected by them.

The infinite and incomprehenſible majeſty of God then is an object beyond the limits of reaſon; we are incapable of forming any idea of him; and conſequently, from whatſoever ultimate maxims reaſon may proceed with relation to ſcripture truth, ſhe is debarred of any appeal to God himſelf, or to any imagination ſhe may conceive herſelf able to entertain of him.

But the ſcriptures are admitted to be the word of God, and whatſoever is ſet forth in them is admitted to be true; henceforward reaſon may proceed. The ſcriptures are that ultimate, that axiom, beyond which we are not to ſeek for the grounds of whatſoever is aſſerted in them; they are the word of God, and they are true. This is granted, and from this datum there lies no appeal.

Come

Come on then, for reaſon has now found a commencement to her work; and firſt ſhe ſays, the ſcriptures, being true, contain no contradictions, the truth of contradictories being impoſſible: Her buſineſs then it is to reconcile what ſeem to be contradictions, to compare, one with another, the paſſages which lead to particular concluſions, and to yield her aſſent to that which ſhe cannot underſtand, referring it only to the credibility of him who is the author of it; to acquieſce in the conduct of infinite wiſdom, and not ſeek for principles beyond her own limits. By ſuch a proceſs ſhe will never pronounce any thing to be impoſſible, the impoſſibility of which ſhe does not ſee upon a compariſon of perceptible qualities; but, acknowledging herſelf incapable of giving counſel to her Maker, believe that he has employed means for our ſalvation which we cannot look into; truſt him with the means who has ſo graciouſly employed them for ſuch an end; look upon the end not with vain and impious curioſity, but with unbounded gratitude; habituate our minds by ſuch a proſpect to love him, and from love and gratitude aſcend to the deſire to pleaſe him; ſeek from himſelf the means of pleaſing him, and with renewed love and gratitude learn that to bear good will towards man, is the conduct moſt conformable to his will, that by which we ſhall beſt aſcribe glory to God on high, and by which we ſhall procure to ourſelves eternal happineſs through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord and Saviour. Is this a conduct beneath the dignity of reaſon? It is a glorious undertaking which is committed to her charge.—Let us now come more directly to the point.

If then the teſtimony of our Saviour be allowed, and the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, to which he refers enquirers into his nature, be admitted as credible; and if by theſe it be declared that Jeſus Chriſt is God from everlaſting,

everlaſting, I ſee not how a doubt is to be entertained that he is God, one with, and equal to, the Father: But if his having appeared clothed with fleſh among men, as a man; if his ſympathetick tears; if his apprehenſive agonies and prayers to have the cup of evil put away from him; if his having fallen under the ſevereſt afflictions, and even having ſuffered an ignominious death, added to his own teſtimony and that of the Holy Ghoſt, be admitted as evidence that he was man, I ſee not how a doubt can be entertained that he was Man, inferior to God, as we are inferior to him: and if theſe be both admitted, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that Jeſus Chriſt is both God and Man: But if both God and Man, I do not ſee the force of the objection to his Godhead, that he has acted and ſuffered as Man; that he refers the preſervation of his human nature to the power which is alone equal to the preſervation of it; that he prays as man for the world, which he ſympathizes with; that he declares his human nature and the man Jeſus to be a meſſenger to man, and acting with power derived of God. For as I believe that men, who make a difficulty of believing that any union between the two natures is poſſible, will hardly inſiſt upon their own capacity to explain the manner of it, or to ſhew that, upon ſuch an union, ſo much of the divinity is derived to the manhood of Chriſt, as to render it independent of God, and able to act for its own purpoſes, without farther application than the exertion of this derived power: ſo I will not admit of their explanations of our bleſſed Saviour's prayers, and declarations that he was ſent; for theſe prayers were breathed by the man Jeſus; and this commiſſion to die for and to adopt a world, was given to the human nature by God, and not to the divine nature of Chriſt, which was itſelf the power, one with the Father, God Almighty, which had ſo ſent forth this man to atone for

us. I am far from ſaying that I am myſelf able to explain this union, God forbid; but that I am not able to explore the ways of an Almighty God, whoſe little creature I am, is not a reaſon why I ſhould doubt his word, when he is pleaſed to reveal any part of them to me. We are told, that the ways of God are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts: And ſhall we attempt to contradict the declarations of his power, becauſe we cannot exert the like? Or queſtion the wiſdom which we cannot comprehend, merely becauſe we cannot comprehend it? Were God pleaſed to open the ſtores of his wiſdom to our eyes, but not to open our eyes to look upon them with more extended faculties than we now enjoy, is it to be imagined that we ſhould comprehend them? Surely not; and wherefore ſhould we reject the belief of that wonderful exertion of his power for our redemption, which he has laid open to us? It is a way of God, and not of man; and is its being wonderful a cauſe? It is a way of God, and not of man; and is its exceeding the limited comprehenſion of our faculties a cauſe? It is not to comprehend that we are required, but to believe; and to yield that degree of aſſent which we call belief, is certainly the beſt, nay the only exertion of our reaſon in the caſe before us; for, having granted that God is true, and that he has ſpoken, the inference is, that what he has ſpoken is true; and as his power is adequate to all things, no exerciſe of it can oppoſe the concluſion drawn; as his wiſdom is infinite, no dictate of it is referred to our judgment; and therefore our judgment muſt retire from giving any deciſion upon other premiſes than thoſe laid down; and conſequently, inſtead of oppoſing, muſt abet the concluſion that follows from thoſe which are ſtated. If our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, though in union with Godhead, was humble, and referred all to God, I ſhould conceive that, inſtead of arrogantly oppoſing,

posing, we should cultivate in ourselves that mind which was in Christ Jesus, and humbly submit to his will, who has in part revealed, and in part reserved for future revelation, the mystery of our redemption, for a mystery I must agree with St. Paul in calling it, rather than with any mere human authority in denying it to be such.

Mr. Lindsey says, That, in a multitude of passages to which he refers, "Jesus Christ formally professes his inferiority and dependence, that he received his being and all his powers from God." It is of no consequence whether the passages referred to prove it or not, for I readily grant him this position, "There is one God, and one mediator between God and Men, the man Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5. And when I have granted it, what will he infer more than I have already laid down, that, as Man, the man Jesus Christ (evidently intended here to be distinguished from God by that name only, and therefore in other respects implied to be one with the father, God) was inferior to God; that is, that having two natures, one was greater, and consequently one less than the other. Were I in the midst of an argument, proving the immortality of the soul of man, to declare, that I laboured under a lingering disease of which I feared that I should die, would even Mr. Lindsey say, that I had confuted my own doctrine of the soul's immortality? Would he pronounce that I meant my soul should die? And yet he might as well, as in the case before us, declare, that when Jesus Christ speaks as Man he denies his Godhead.

I do not mean to say, that there exists any analogy between the union of spirit and flesh in man, and the union of God and Man in Christ; for I do not at all understand

underſtand how the union of ſoul and body exiſts, and conſequently cannot compare it with that which I as little underſtand, for I cannot ſay that I underſtand it leſs; and how, if I am abſolutely unacquainted with an union, which not only ſubſiſts in every perſon I hourly converſe with, but even in myſelf, how, I ſay, am I to declare that an union between God and Man, of which but one inſtance has ever offered itſelf to human obſervation, is impoſſible? And I refer it to Mr. Lindſey, or any of his diſciples, to explain the nature of Spirit, and to ſhew its compatibility with Fleſh; or that of Fleſh, and to ſhew its compatibility with Spirit; and if my requeſt be not complied with, from their abſolute and entire ignorance, I muſt then requeſt farther that they will deſiſt from denying the compatibility of Natures, which they muſt allow they as little underſtand. They yield their aſſent in the one caſe, becauſe daily obſervation confirms the exiſtence of an animal in which ſpirit and fleſh are conjoined, and they take their aſſent to be a concluſion from premiſes ſupplied by reaſon; but becauſe Chriſt is but one, they have not had an opportunity of analyſing him, as they think they have done by their own nature, and ſo deny what they could never have underſtood, had there been as many Chriſts as Men. Would they deſire ſuch an intimacy? would they deſire ſuch a multiplication? ſee where the impious tenet ends, "Jeſus Chriſt once crucified is not a ſufficient atonement for the ſins of mankind." I ſhall make no farther comment than to declare, that whenſoever reaſon withholds belief in that which it comprehends not, merely becauſe it is beyond the reach and comprehenſion of reaſon, the union of the body and ſoul in man muſt be denied; for it never can be proved by reaſon, which muſt underſtand the compatibility of both before the union can be declared to exiſt. I would then adviſe every man not determined to be a

ſceptic,

ſceptic, whom I will not heſitate to pronounce a fool, to look upon a revelation of one, the ſufficiency of which precludes the neceſſity, and conſequently the exiſtence of more, to be adequate to a fuller view of that which admits of a fuller view. In ſhort, my recommendation amounts to no more, nor leſs, than the old eſtabliſhed maxim, that proofs, and conſequently our credit, are to be deduced from the beſt evidence the nature of the caſe admits of.

The beſt evidence then, which the nature of the caſe before us admits of, is the revelation of God, allowed to have been made by him, and admitted incontrovertibly true. Whatſoever is related therein, is advanced upon authority ſufficient to warrant our aſſent; but as the revelation is not itſelf ſupported by an equally ſtrong evidence as that which, upon admittance, it affords to whatſoever it teſtifies, we are not required to yield more than belief to the aſſertions contained in it; were it as certainly the word of God, as the word of God is certainly true, we ſhould poſſeſs little leſs than certainty of the facts revealed therein; but being allowed, upon that evidence which is unqueſtionably ſufficient to induce credit, it remains to be enquired into, whether it bears teſtimony to the divinity of our bleſſed Reedeemer Jeſus Chriſt, or not?

As I have now reached the threſhold, and am juſt entering into the proofs, and the nature of the proofs, which the ſcriptures afford of the truth of this great myſtery, once more let me warn, and deeply inculcate the warning, to beware of the deluſions of natural religion, if ſuch a religion there be, and if that which we conceive to have been derived from nature, be not rather a reſiduum, after our pride has rejected whatſoever is revealed beyond its reach.

The

The Chineſe philoſopher believes, that the earth ſtands upon the back of an elephant, which ſtands upon the back of a tortoiſe, which ſtands upon the back of, &c. &c. &c. Now, ſuppoſe this ſame philoſopher to be inſtructed in the Copernican ſyſtem, and that he had, upon full conſideration, yielded his aſſent to the great probability of its truth; would it not rather ſeem abſurd in him, after a time, to recur to his old tenets, becauſe the ſufficiency of the ſun's attractive power to ſupport this world, was inconſiſtent with the occupation of his old elephant and tortoiſe, and that he could not ſee how it ſhould be poſſible for animals ſo loaded, and of themſelves none of the ſwifteſt, to carry the earth, whirling through its orbit with ſuch aſtoniſhing velocity? Juſt ſo abſurd ſhall we be, if, after our aſſent to the truth of God, and admiſſion that he has revealed himſelf, we ſuffer any one previous perſuaſion to recur, and require that ſcripture ſhould be conſonant to it, after we have admitted that the word of God is true, whether it be conſonant to any previous perſuaſion or not. The ſenſible Chineſe would ſurely reject his ancient tenets upon the admiſſion of that which he had aſſented to, becauſe of the value of thoſe arguments which had induced his aſſent; let us then, upon the admiſſion of the ſcriptures as the ultimate boundary of argument, reject whatſoever ſeems to make againſt their ceded truth; howſoever we may perſuade ourſelves that reaſon had ſupplied it to us, we muſt have expatiated beyond her limits to ſeek for the tenet, for within her proper province it is not to be found.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Nature of the Evidence of our Saviour's Divinity afforded by the Scripture.

THE full effulgence of the Goſpel did not burſt ſuddenly upon mankind. That ſun of righteouſneſs, by the light of which we are enabled to walk, did not at once reach its meridian height; ſo exceedingly gradual was its progreſs, that, when firſt it dawned upon the world, its rays were not diſcernible; "it ſhone in darkneſs, and the darkneſs comprehended it not;" it encreaſed in ſplendor, but was not ſufficient to be the "light of thoſe who come into the world; at length the day-ſtar aroſe, and a light ſhone forth to lighten the Gentiles, and the day-ſpring from on high hath viſited us, to give light to them that ſit in darkneſs, and in the ſhadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace."

To drop the metaphor. We find the prophecies of our bleſſed Saviour, from great obſcurity, become more and more explicit as they approach the great event: At the firſt they were extreamly indefinite, and ſuch only as were adapted to the purpoſes for which they were pronounced. The firſt hope of redemption to mankind accompanied the ſentence of condemnation, and was graciouſly conveyed by God himſelf, who comforted the forlorn ſtate of our fallen parents with a promiſe conceived in general terms, that the ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe the head of the ſerpent which had beguiled her.

Noah is afterwards taught by the Spirit to hope, and to exclaim, "bleſſed be the Lord God of Shem." To ſhew

ſhew that this bleſſing is a prophecy, it is enough to ſay, that Noah ſpoke it in a train of prophecy concerning the future ſtate of his own ſons and their poſterity. From Shem deſcended Abraham, to Abraham was the promiſe made, and from Abraham, as concerning the fleſh, Chriſt came. From the manner in which the bleſſing upon Shem is pronounced, I incline greatly to believe that this deſcent was the object of Noah's prophetic viſion; it ſeems to have been the reſult of his having foreſeen, that, in the progeny of Shem, all the families of the earth ſhould be bleſſed: and let it be remembered, that Noah was no unconcerned prophet in whatſoever ſhould happen to any future inhabitants of the earth; for all were then equally to deſcend from him as their common parent; and well might he rejoice and bleſs the God of Shem, by one of whoſe line he foreſaw that all his poſterity ſhould be bleſſed.

To Abraham, becauſe he had obeyed the voice of the Lord, it is foretold, (and this is by the New Teſtament declared to be ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt) that in his ſeed all the nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed; and this promiſe is from time to time renewed in that line of which our Saviour was to be born; to Iſaac, in preference to Iſhmael; to Jacob, in preference to Eſau; and to Judah, in preference to his eleven brothers. To Judah, indeed, there is ſomewhat of more particular revelation made, for the length of time during which he ſhall bear the ſceptre (that is, continue a tribe) is made commenſurate with the coming of Shiloh, upon which the ſceptre is to depart from him. Judah alone continued to be a tribe after the Aſſyrian Captivity, and then only ceaſed when Chriſt came; whence, however difficult it may be to explain this paſſage with certainty, it is to be preſumed that the prophecy of Jacob, concerning the ſceptre of Judah and its time

of

of departure, bears reference to the coming of the Meſſiah.

Moſes, who is the relater of what was ſpoken before his day, in his own perſon alſo often ſpeaks of a future prophet: And in the compelled prophecies of Balaam, when he poured forth bleſſings from a heart replete with curſes, and in ſpight of that indignation with which he aſcended the rock to denounce evil, foreſhewed the future brightneſs of the ſtar that ſhall come forth out of Jacob, there is ſomething which, however obſcure it may be, is certainly referable to our Lord.

David hoped for one of his ſeed to ſit upon his throne; and though he looked for a deſcendent from himſelf, he has nevertheleſs "in ſpirit called him Lord." That our Saviour was the object of David's expectation, though he knew not why he called him Lord, and only truſted that ſome great good was promiſed to him, the declaration of the angel to the Virgin Mary evinces, who ſays to her of the child which ſhe is to bear, and whom ſhe is to call Jeſus, "He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the Higheſt; and the Lord ſhall give unto him the throne of his Father David, and he ſhall reign over the houſe of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there ſhall be no end," Luke i. 32, 33.

Every ſucceeding prophet throughout the Old Teſtament found a conſolation to the ſeveral troubles of Judea, in looking forward to that which was revealed to them in a general way by the ſpirit of Chriſt; but the full declaration of that which was ſo revealed was withheld from them; they underſtood it not themſelves, and even when they ſpoke of the divinity of our Saviour,

like Balaam, they ſpoke it conſtrainedly; they uttered only the word which the Lord had put into their mouths. If they who ſpoke it were ignorant of its meaning, it is no great wonder that they who heard did not underſtand the full force of the prophecy of the Godhead of him who was to come; nor is their miſapprehenſion a reaſon why we ſhould doubt that the prophets foretold it. The purpoſe of prophecy is "to tell before it come to paſs, that when it come to paſs we may believe," John xiv. 29. And the object of the prophecy of the Old Teſtament is the coming of a great deliverer, of whom ſuch ſeeming contrarieties are declared, that it is not poſſible the Jews could ever have formed a definite idea of the expected Meſſiah. It is foreſhewn of our Saviour, (whom all allow to be the Chriſt) that he was to be a King of the ſeed of David, and to ſit upon his throne; that he was to be cut off, but not for himſelf; that he was to be exalted and extolled, and to be very high; oppreſſed, afflicted, bruiſed and put to grief, numbered with the tranſgreſſors, taken from priſon, and from judgment, and cut off out of the land of the living; ruling the nations, &c. Iſaiah lii. and liii. With ſuch irreconcileable declarations were the hopes of the Jews kept alive; but in all this there is nothing that could have ſuggeſted an expectation that God himſelf would come; for how ſhould the idea of his infinite majeſty unite itſelf with that of a man of ſorrows and acquainted with grief, having a cheek turned to the ſcorner? and how, indeed, could even ſuch an idea as this agree with the expectation of a great King, to overcome all their enemies? It cannot, therefore, be admitted in argument againſt the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, that it was not underſtood by the Jews; for how ſhould they underſtand it, when the prophets, who propheſied of the grace that ſhould come unto us, have enquired and

ſearched

ſearched diligently of this ſalvation, "ſearching what, or what manner of time, the ſpirit of Chriſt which was within them did ſignify, when it teſtified beforehand the ſufferings of Chriſt, and the glory that ſhould follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that, not unto themſelves, but unto us, they did miniſter the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the goſpel unto you, with the Holy Ghoſt ſent down from heaven; which things the angels deſire to look into, 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, 12. and that many prophets have deſired to ſee theſe things which our Saviour ſhewed forth, and have not ſeen them."

To us then, who have come after the event, it belongs to explain the prophecy, as that which is foretold is come to paſs; and therefore we muſt ceaſe to look for ſuch teſtimony from the prophets as ſhould have explained the fact, to ſuch as had never ſeen it: of the ſufferings of Chriſt, and the glory that ſhould follow, they could form no certain idea whatſoever, nor did the prophecy put things into that order, as to impart a notion that the glory was to be ſubſequent to the ſufferings; and this I aſſert, notwithſtanding that Iſaiah had ſaid "he ſhall divide the ſpoil with the ſtrong: becauſe he hath poured out his ſoul unto death," Iſa. liii. 12. For even the expectation of a man to ariſe from the dead, never ſeems, by the hiſtory of the Jews, throughout the Old Teſtament, in the leaſt degree to have ſuggeſted itſelf to them; for if it had, Chriſt crucified could not have been to the Jews a ſtumbling block; and it is even probable, that ſuch a fact, clearly underſtood, might have withheld their hands from inflicting that death whereby "Chriſt was perfected."

Still nearer to the manifeſtation of Chriſt the Angel has declared, that the Prophet, who ſhould be the

preparer of the ways of the Lord, ſhould be filled with the Holy Ghoſt, even from his mother's womb; and Zacharias, upon the birth of John, breaks that ſilence which had been impoſed upon him becauſe of his unbelief, and, being filled with the Holy Ghoſt, cried out, "Bleſſed be the Lord God of Iſrael, for he hath viſited and redeemed his people, and hath raiſed up an horn of ſalvation for us, in the houſe of his ſervant David; as he ſpake by the mouth of the holy prophets, which have been ſince the world began," Luke i. 67, 68, 69; and then ſpeaking of his own ſon, who was the appointed harbinger of the Chriſt, whom he has already called the Lord God of Iſrael, he ſays, "and thou child ſhall be called the Prophet of the Higheſt; for thou ſhalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways," Luke i. 76. The angel ſaid alſo to the Virgin Mary, when he gave her aſſurance of the birth of her ſon to be called Jeſus, "He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the Higheſt; and the Lord God ſhall give him the throne of his father David;" and "that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God," Luke i. 32, 33, 35. The babe leapt in the womb of Elizabeth for joy upon the ſalutation of Mary, and Elizabeth aſks this remarkable queſtion, ſimilar in expreſſion to the prophecy of David already cited, "whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord ſhould come to me?" Luke i. 43. The ſhepherds are told by an angel, "unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Chriſt the Lord," Luke ii. 11. At the preſentation of the infant Redeemer in the temple, Simeon, to whom it was revealed by the Holy Ghoſt, that he ſhould not ſee death before he had ſeen the Lord's Chriſt, taking the babe in his arms "bleſſed God, and expreſſed his contentment to depart then, his eyes having ſeen the promiſed ſource of ſalvation,"

Luke

Luke i. 28, 29. And subsequent to these mysterious predictions concerning the supposed child of a carpenter, came forth a prophet, cotemporary in birth with Jesus Christ, appointed to be his immediate forerunner, to prepare the way of the Lord, and to make his paths straight, and he declared of him that "he that cometh from above, is above all;" and that "he that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life," John iii. 31, 36.

Thus, from the first obscure hint of salvation to our first parents, do the prophecies gradually approximate to an explanation of the great glory which should in the end be revealed; but by no means have they become so explicit yet, as to render a revelation unnecessary; nay, there is yet to proceed a new species of previous intimation to mankind of "the salvation of God which all flesh shall see," Luke iii. 6; and accordingly now came forth the great subject of all that had been testified, but not yet to be declared, nor yet indeed the full subject of the prophecy, nor of the subsequent testimony of the spirit, having before him that mighty work to do, toward which the hopes of the prophets looked as the source of deliverance, in vain searching into what the manner of it was to be; a work by which we have received the atonement, and obtained reconciliation, the word and ministry of which was afterwards to be committed by God to those who were to be the appointed witnesses of our Lord: and this ministry of reconciliation is that which alone can be, according to the scriptures, pronounced the manifestation of Jesus Christ; and therefore I consider himself, even the Lord of glory, who was crucified, who arose from the grave, and ascended into heaven, as only bearing, by his miracles, a practical testimony during his stay on earth, to that which should be revealed

vealed of him when his work ſhould be finiſhed. This, indeed, I admit to be a much cloſer evidence of the Godhead than any given before; and that, perhaps, by which the minds of men ſhould be led to look upon the expected King of the Jews in a much more exalted light than the former prophecies had inſtructed them to do. It is ſuch an evidence as, when referred to, might well provide credit, when it ſhould come to paſs, for that which before it came to paſs it had foreſhewn. Our Saviour himſelf, for the moſt part, declines bearing witneſs to himſelf, but refers both to the ſcriptures which had now begun to be fulfilled, and which he deſires to have diligently ſought into as about to receive their full completion, and to the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt hereafter to be given for the purpoſe of manifeſting him; and whenever he does bear record, it is rather ſuch as he would have ſecond to that which ſhould follow the finiſhing of his work here, thence to derive its explanation, than ſuch as he would have principal in the line of evidence.

Had our bleſſed Lord and Saviour borne any ultimate teſtimony to the Jews that he was God, they would have known this hidden myſtery; and, "had they known it," ſays St. Paul, "they would not have crucified the Lord of glory," 1 Cor. ii. 8; and ſo the very end of his coming in the fleſh would have been defeated; mankind muſt ſtill have remained due to the juſtice of God, without the atonement which we have received by the death of Chriſt. The blood of our gracious Redeemer was to be the price of our ſalvation, and would it have been conſiſtent with wiſdom to take meaſures to prevent the ſhedding of it? It was enough that his miracles ſhould teſtify of him to thoſe who were afterwards to preach him, and offer them to mankind as marks of a life conſiſtent with what they ſhould relate

relate concerning his death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion, which were the great perſuaſives to believe in his Godhead, and in that mighty work which he came in the fleſh to do for our ſake.

Our Saviour, I ſay, did not frequently bear record to himſelf; but continuing the train of prophecy of that by which we alſo have become the children of Abraham, the Iſrael of God, even of that which all the prophets had in view, the redemption of makind, he very frequently foretells his own ſufferings, that "the Son of man ſhall be lifted up as Moſes lifted up the ſerpent in the wilderneſs;" that "he will raiſe the temple in three days, and this he ſpake of his body;" and "that he will go before us into heaven." That this great event, attended by ſuch mighty conſequences to us, conſolatory in every woe of Iſrael, and making all men heirs of ſalvation, ſhould be the object of prophecy, and of the ſubſequent teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, no man ſurely can doubt, when, in order to enable us to become partakers of the benefits thence derived to mankind, it is neceſſary that we believe in Chriſt, "who gave himſelf a ranſom for all, to be teſtified in due time," 1 Tim. ii. 6. "How beautiful then upon the mountains are the feet of thoſe who bring good tidings of good!" A preacher, even the Holy Spirit, has inſtructed us in the ſalvation which is of God, and "ſaid unto Zion, thy God reigneth."

This then is the line of teſtimony; this the object of revelation, namely, that "Chriſt, by being made perfect, has become the author of eternal ſalvation unto all them that obey him;" that he hath been the Redeemer of mankind by the full accompliſhment of all that he came to do for us; and not, according to Mr. Lindſey, that he has merely come into the world as a teacher,

teacher, the truth of whose doctrines were to be witnessed by his death. And let not this be considered as an unsupported suggestion of my own, it is authorised by St. Luke in the first chapter of the Acts; where, speaking of that history which he had before set forth of the life of our Saviour, he is so far from considering it as the manifestation of Christ, that he says, "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was taken up:" so that all the life of our Lord in the flesh was but a commencement of that which was afterwards to be revealed. In the moment of his ascent too, the same apostle presents Christ telling his disciples that "ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth," Acts i. 8. Of what were they to be witnesses unto him? of that which he had already died to testify? Was his death then so defective a testimony to those who had seen it in Jerusalem, and who had also seen his resurrection? If these were intended but as a mere testimony that he had lived, wrought miracles, and taught among them, we must declare that they have come very short of answering the purpose, if there still remained a necessity of appointing farther witnesses to concur in proving their object. Was it ever before heard of, that the breathless corpse of a man is a better evidence of his having been born into the world than his living and active body, that our Saviour's death should be considered only as a proof of his life? Did a continued series of miracles, performed before the eyes of the multitude, stand in need of one more, to prove, to those who had seen them, that they had been performed? or are those moral doctrines, which our blessed Redeemer delivered to mankind, of such a dubious

nature,

nature, that any man ſhould entertain a doubt of their juſtice, requiring ſo ſtrong an engine as the death and reſurrection of the preacher, in order to remove it? No, but on the contrary, ſo obvious is their rectitude, ſo far from requiring any teſtimony whatſoever to their indiſputable truth, that many who never became Chriſtians allowed their value; and even Trajan, who perſecuted thoſe "who called upon Chriſt as God," adopted from his ſermons that charitable doctrine of returning good for evil. But of what were they to be witneſſes unto him? of his death and reſurrection? What? to Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and to Samaria? did Chriſt hang inviſible on a croſs at Jeruſalem, that a witneſs ſhall be wanting to teſtify it? or was his death and reſurrection a tranſaction carried on in ſecret? On the contrary, at the very time when he was dragged "from judgment to pour out his ſoul unto death; when he was numbered with the tranſgreſſors, and made interceſſion for the tranſgreſſors," Iſaiah liii. all Judea were eye-witneſſes of the fact; for it was at the time of the paſſover, when all Judea had come up to Jeruſalem, the ſcene of the tranſaction, to celebrate that feaſt: nay, farther, where all Judea, as if to fill up the meaſure of her rebellions, and juſtify her approaching deſolation, had, with one voice, cried out, "crucify him, crucify him." Of this then they were not to be witneſſes unto him; but of that which the prophets had not made manifeſt, of that which the life and leſſons of our Saviour himſelf had not made manifeſt, without farther explanation. They were to be witneſſes unto him that he was the expected Chriſt, and that the Chriſt was the "mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Prince of peace;" that the Godhead of him, whom their own eyes had ſeen, ſo far from being a great king, that he was actually in "the form of a ſervant," and an ignominious ſufferer, was the royalty

which they had looked for in the expected king of Israel; that he was indeed a "king who had all things put under his feet, who had led captivity captive, and hath given to us the victory over death and the grave; a king, whose throne endureth for ever, and the sceptre of whose kingdom is a right sceptre." To these witnesses of Jesus Christ the Holy Ghost was given, even the spirit of truth, to shew forth the means of our redemption, by which his infinite mercy had reconciled mankind to his infinite justice: whatsoever the prophets had said was given to them to understand, to open, and to reconcile: and whatsoever our Lord had done and said in the flesh, was given to their remembrance to corroborate that which they should themselves declare; and these they have accordingly called upon, and shewed to be a testimony bearing toward the truth, which it was their appointment to render fully manifest, even this great truth, that the blood which streamed from a supposed malefactor, dying for imputed blasphemy upon a cross, was the blood of God himself, Acts xx. 28. "poured out for our transgressions," and "by which we have received the atonement." This is the full manifestation of Christ to mankind; till the work was finished it could not be related, and, when done, so portentous was the deed in itself, so above the reach of all human intellect, that it required and obtained a miraculous testimony; a testimony precisely adequate to that which is required of those who receive it, our belief, which alone is called for as the terms upon which this great salvation is offered to us, "that eternal salvation of which, by being made perfect, he became the author unto all them that obey him," Heb. v. 9.

The prophecies waited for their explanation till all which they had predicted should have come to pass, and

and therefore were not evidence to thoſe who lived before the event. The four goſpels relate, that a man had come into the world endowed with a power of working miracles, which he was perpetually exerting in acts of benevolence; inſtructing mankind in virtue, by leſſons ſuperior to thoſe of any other man; ſpeaking of the kingdom of God, and ſaying, that he was the door by which it was to be entered; inculcating faith in God, and the hope in his mercies, ariſing from the cultivation of piety toward him, and goodwill toward man; teſtifying that he was the object of former prophecy; foreſhewing things which the hearers remembered, when they came to paſs, to have heard of, but not to have underſtood before; dying upon a croſs, ariſing from the grave, and aſcending into heaven; that is, the goſpels relate the hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt in the fleſh, but have by no means revealed him, nor declared finally who or what he is, wherefore he died, aroſe, and aſcended. They tell us that he did the work for which he came, but the full import of this work, and why undertaken by this man who finiſhed it, was not the object of the hiſtorian to reveal; and till it was finiſhed it could not be revealed to what end it had been done. From our Saviour we are not to expect this revelation, for his aſcenſion into heaven being a part, the final part of his work, he continued not among men to declare its end. Another teſtimony then muſt be found, and that ſuch as muſt be very powerful; we accordingly now find the apoſtolic body come forth in the ſtrength of the Lord, endowed with miraculous powers to be exerted before all hearers, and bleſſed with elocution in every language, that all hearers might underſtand and believe; and thus the end of all that has been done is declared; that our ſalvation was the object is revealed; that for our ſins Chriſt died, and that for our juſtification he roſe again;

that he has taken our nature into heaven, "having appeared to put away ſin, by the ſacrifice of himſelf," Heb. ix. 26. and, "by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. ix. 12. that, becauſe he can have a feeling of our infirmities, having been in all points tempted like as we are, he is now our high-prieſt and interceſſor; and that, for the ſame gracious reaſon, he is to be our judge, when, in the laſt day, he ſhall come forth in his glory, and all nations ſhall be gathered before him, even before their God.

I hope and believe now that I have pointed out the degrees of proof which have been afforded to the world, that the Lord of life, Jeſus Chriſt, who redeemed it, is the God of our ſalvation; and having ſhewn by what light he has been manifeſted, even that which has come from himſelf after his aſcenſion and reſumption of his former glory, it is eaſy to ſee that the prophets and evangeliſts are to be read by that light only: by this alone the expectations of Iſrael are to be reconciled, and the prophets found to have ſpoken conſiſtently; and what other circumſtances could have reduced their predictions to good ſenſe, but a revelation of the glory that has followed the ſufferings of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt? what other circumſtances than the death, burial, reſurrection, and aſcenſion of a man revealed to be the "King of kings, and Lord of lords," Rev. xix. 16; "who has become the captain of our ſalvation, who ſhall come once again with power and great glory, ſitting upon the throne of his glory, bringing his reward with him, to judge all men, could reconcile the expectations which the prophets had imparted, that the Meſſiah ſhould be a King, ſitting on the throne of David for ever; that he ſhould be a great deliverer, ſubduing all

all nations under them; and alſo, that he ſhould be a man deſpiſed and rejected of men, wounded for our tranſgreſſions, and bruiſed for our iniquities, upon whom was the chaſtiſement of our peace, and by whoſe ſtripes we are healed?" Iſa. liii. 5. for ſuch were the indefinite hopes of the Jews, and therefore their ignorance is never to be conſidered as of any weight in argument againſt the Godhead of Chriſt, nor a defect of teſtimony in the Old Teſtament taken by itſelf, and not explained by the ſubſequent revelation, as any ground for denying that which it was never written with a view of ultimately proving. The ſame thing may be aſſerted of the four evangelical hiſtories of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, they were not intended to have been ultimate; and, conſequently, if partial quotations do not evince his divinity to partial enquirers, it is not in the leaſt degree an argument that he was not one with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, God. Thoſe hiſtories, I have ſaid already, were written with a view of ſetting before all men the works which our bleſſed Redeemer did, in evidence of a power concerning which he withheld his own teſtimony, but for the promulgation of which he refers to the ſcriptures already written, and to the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt hereafter to be afforded, the truth of which, he foreſaw, would be leſs liable to doubt than that of his own record, which he therefore declined bearing, ſaying, that it would not be received as true. Had our Lord therefore been wholly ſilent upon this head, not even his abſolute ſilence would have derogated from the evidence of his divinity. "He came not to bear witneſs of himſelf," "but to be teſtified in due time;" and he even ſaw that his teſtimony, had he attempted to have borne it, would be rejected, as an evil interpretation was put upon the moſt benevolent exertion of his power; that the faith

of

of even his perpetual hearers was defective, and that they had fallen from him, becauſe they could not comprehend him. He therefore looked for the belief of mankind from a miraculous declaration and teſtimony of his Godhead, to be borne, not after a partial, but a full execution of that great work which he took our nature upon him to do; and ſaw that Godhead would be more readily acquieſced in, as in union with a man who ſhould be teſtified to have riſen from the dead, and aſcended into heaven, than with one, the courſe of whoſe innocent life was ſeemingly unable to reſiſt perſecutions and ſorrows, nay the infliction of an ignominious death. An acquaintance with grief, a cheek turned to the ſcorner, the grave and the ſhadow of death, which he had often (and even with agonies which certified his feeling of our infirmities) predicted to be all before him, were ſo far from conveying an idea of divinity, that they afforded but a very humiliating picture of humanity. The belief of mankind was not required from ſuch circumſtances, and they who inflicted thoſe miſeries upon him were forgiven, for they knew not what they did. It is at the ſame time true, that Jeſus Chriſt has not left us without a record of himſelf, as I ſhall hereafter have occaſion to ſhew, but it was carried only ſo far as to become a teſtimony, when explained afterwards, otherwiſe they who crucified him muſt have known what they did. On the day on which our Lord was betrayed, knowing that his hour was come, he ſays to his diſciples "I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the ſpirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf; but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak: and he will ſhew you things to come. He ſhall glorify me: for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.

you. All things that the Father hath, are mine: therefore ſaid I, that he ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you," John xvi. 12, 13, 14, 15. What is this but ſaying, that as they are as yet unable to bear the full revelation of his nature, he will in a future time ſhew it to them by the ſpirit who ſhall ſpeak as he ſhall receive of Chriſt. And that it is the full declaration of the Godhead, which, he ſays, they are as yet unable to bear, and which he will reveal by the ſpirit who ſhall teſtify of the truth, is evident from the teſtimony which he proceeds to ſay this ſpirit ſhall bear to him; for "he ſhall glorify him," having received that which he is to ſhew from Chriſt, whoſe it is, and from the Father, whoſe it is, equal poſſeſſors of the glory which ſhall be revealed. A triumph over death, and an aſcent into heaven, were firſt to intervene; and theſe, added to every miracle performed in the preſence of multitudes, were facts, which, when referred to, were fully ſufficient to ſhew forth a power that none could doubt to be the power of God; and if the Holy Ghoſt, by miracles ſubſequent to ſuch an act as that of riſing from the darkneſs of the grave to the manſions of light, ſhould teſtify of him who had ſo acted, that he was God, I ſee not how a more proper line of evidence could have been adopted, or a more certain means of ſpreading information among men, not hardened againſt the receipt of it, deviſed; nor do I ſee it to be leſs than an impious preſumption to deny the atteſted fact, becauſe we have not ourſelves had the conduct of the evidence, and therefore do not find it where it is not reaſonably to be expected.

The doctrine of Chriſt's godhead then may be conſidered as imparted to us by four different ſorts of revelation; firſt, by the prophecies and the law, or in general terms that which was called the ſcriptures, before

fore the writing of the New Teſtament, to which we are referred, and told that "they are they which teſtify of me;" ſecondly, by the teſtimony of our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, whether by words or works, throughout the writings of the evangeliſts; thirdly, by the teſtimony of the apoſtles, confirmed by the Holy Ghoſt, to which our Saviour uſually referred enquirers into his nature, whether delivered by them in the goſpels, which were written after the Holy Ghoſt had been given to the writers, or by their explanation of the nature and the purpoſes of his having come and ſuffered in the fleſh, in their ſermons throughout the Acts, and in their epiſtles; and fourthly, by the teſtimony of Chriſt himſelf, after his aſcenſion and reaſſumption of that glory wherewith he had been glorified before the world was, delivered by his having ſent the comforter according to his frequent promiſes that he, and that the father (promiſcuouſly named) would ſend him, by his compliance with the prayers of the apoſtles, his appearance in divers circumſtances, and by the viſion ſhewed to St. John in the revelation, in which he ſpeaks of himſelf in the ſame terms, as God, before his incarnation, had ſpoken to the prophets.

This is the order in which the evidence is placed before us, and in which I ſhall therefore produce it in the following chapter. Were it to be ſtated according to the degree of its ſtrength, it ought to be reverſed.

There is yet another ſpecies of teſtimony borne to the divinity of our gracious Redeemer, reſulting from the reconcileableneſs of the whole of ſacred writ, upon the adopting this propoſition as a datum, namely, that Chriſt is God. Were a ſubject to be treated ſo enigmatically by a man of ſenſe, as that it ſhould eſcape the underſtanding of all his readers, and yet leave them con-

convinced upon the credit of the author, that the book itſelf was worth ſtudy and labour; were there ſcarce an intelligible ſentence contained in the book, and yet a certainty that it contained much matter; and were there at length to ariſe a man whoſe ready faculties ſhould alight upon one propoſition by which that whole book ſhould be explained, to which every obſcure aſſertion ſhould be referred, and by the reference to which they ſhould become clear and perſpicuous; and therefore it ſhould appear, that this propoſition was the object of every ſentence, the darkneſs of which it diſpelled; could any man pretend that this was not the object of the writer; or conceive that any one point, thus borne down upon by every argument, was not the point intended to be illuſtrated and proved? certainly not. And if, on the other hand, the contradictory of that propoſition was a point to which the proceſs of the argument ſo little referred, as that it ſhould ſtill continue obſcure when referred to it; would any man ſay that this was the writer's object? certainly not. Exactly ſuch is the ſtate of the Bible; every poſition falls into ſenſe, the tenour of it becomes a courſe of argument the inſtant that the divinity of our Saviour in union with manhood is acknowledged to be its object; whereas, upon a denial of this propoſition, there is not on earth a book ſo fraught with contradictions and irreconcilable abſurdities, as that which is acknowledged to be the word of the God of truth. Partial quotations therefore, and paſſages taken from the whole conſiſtent word of God, are to be conſidered as of no value whatſoever in argument; they cannot afford any proof of any thing: and nothing contained in the ſacred writings is to be explained but as it ſtands in context with the whole. Nothing leſs therefore than the whole of the Bible is to be conſidered as the goſpel of Chriſt; and from the whole, taken together, his almighty Godhead is to be deduced.

CHAP. III.

The Evidence of our Saviour's Divinity afforded by the Scriptures.

AS I have already ſaid that the Old Teſtament affords but a very ſmall part of the teſtimony of the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt, I ſhall produce but few ſeparate paſſages from it, under the head of prophecy: ſuch as receive their explanation from the New Teſtament, being better brought under that head. It is not to ſhew that the prophets have foretold our Lord and Saviour that I am engaged, for that were an eaſy office; but to ſhew that they have foretold his divinity; and that the expected Meſſiah was, though ignorantly, by them declared to be God himſelf.

From the prophecies of the Old Teſtament I take the following proofs of the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt.

I.

"Therefore the Lord himſelf ſhall give you a ſign, behold a virgin ſhall conceive, and bear a Son, and ſhall call his name Immanuel," Iſaiah vii. 14. This prophecy is referred to by St. Matthew, declared to be of our Saviour, and the name interpreted to be "God with us."

II.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government ſhall be upon his ſhoulder: and his name ſhall be called, Wonderful, Counſellor, the mighty God, the Everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace," Iſai. ix. 6.

III.

"Thus ſaith the Lord the King of Iſrael, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hoſts, I am the firſt, and I am the

the laſt, and beſides me there is no God," Iſai. xliv. 6. This aſſertion is made by God to Iſaiah, and by Jeſus Chriſt (verbatim) to St. John, Rev. ii. 8. God, in the ſubſequent verſes, declares his prerogatives to the prophet; the ſame are applicable to the ſame firſt and laſt, "is there a God beſides me? yea there is no God, I know not any." This God then is Jeſus Chriſt.

IV.

"Awake, awake, put on ſtrength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in the antient days, in the generations of old. Art thou not it which hath dried the ſea, the waters of the great deep, that hath made the depths of the ſea a way for the ranſomed to paſs over?" Iſai. li. 9. 10. The anſwer to this call has the following words in it, "But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the ſea, whoſe waves roared: the Lord of Hoſts in his name," Iſai. li. 15. To this entire chapter, and the two following, I refer for the explanation of theſe texts which I have brought to evince the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, and which I take to be even of themſelves ſufficient for that purpoſe. The arm of the Lord is here invoked, and in making anſwer, the arm of the Lord declares "I am the Lord thy God." The arm of the Lord, and the Lord God, are then with Iſaiah ſynonimous terms; but he afterwards ſays "the Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth ſhall ſee the ſalvation of our God," Iſai. lii. 10: and again, "Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" Iſai. liii. 1. To the former of theſe two texts St. Luke refers, and declares expreſsly that it is ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt, for he relates that they were uttered by St. John the Baptiſt, whoſe office was to be the forerunner of our Saviour, Luke iii. 6. To the latter St. John refers, chap. xii. verſe 38, where he quotes the verſe at large concerning the unbelief in

Chriſt, and ſays, "theſe things ſaid Eſaias, when he ſaw his glory, and ſpake of him," John xii. 41. Here then is the ſame arm of the Lord, which is ſynonimous with God, declared to be Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe name is therefore ſynonimous with God, one with him who is the "Lord thy God." St. Paul alſo intimates, that Chriſt was the leader of the Iſraelites through the wilderneſs, ſaying, "neither let us tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted," 1 Cor. x. 9; to which I refer.

V.

The arm of the Lord is thus foretold again, "behold, the Lord God will come with ſtrong hand, and his arm ſhall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. He ſhall feed his flock like a ſhepherd," Iſa. xl. 10, 11. In the Revelation, our Saviour ſays to St. John, "behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me," Rev. xxii. 12. And in the goſpel he ſays, "I am the good ſhepherd," John x. 11. St. Paul ſays of him, "now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jeſus, that great ſhepherd of the ſheep, through the blood of the everlaſting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleaſing in his ſight, through Jeſus Chriſt; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." Heb. xiii. 20, 21. Here we find Iſaiah's words concerning the arm of the Lord (the ſame as God) pronounced by our Saviour concerning himſelf, both in earth and in heaven, and alſo teſtified of him by St. Paul, whoſe doxology aſſiſts us to pronounce of Jeſus Chriſt, in the words of Iſaiah immediately preceding the text before us, "behold your God."

VI.

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publiſheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publiſheth ſalvation,

ſalvation, that ſaith unto Zion, thy God reigneth!" Iſai. lii. 7. St. Paul, ſpeaking of the neceſſity of a preacher to inſtruct men in the belief on Chriſt, that they may call upon him and be ſaved, directly applies theſe words of Iſaiah, as being prophetick of a preacher who ſhould publiſh ſalvation, and ſay unto Zion, "thy God reigneth," Rom. x. 15. If then the promulgation of the goſpel of our bleſſed Lord and Saviour be correſpondent to this prophecy, the preacher of Chriſt is ſurely he who ſays "thy God reigneth."

VII.

"Out of the mouth of babes and ſucklings haſt thou ordained ſtrength," or "perfected praiſe," (which is the interpretation of the New Teſtament) Pſa. viii. 2. Theſe words David directs to God, whoſe name he declares to be excellent. When children in the temple cried "Hoſanna to the Son of David," and the Chief Prieſts and Scribes were diſpleaſed at them for it, our Saviour himſelf juſtified the children by aſſuming the direction of theſe words to himſelf, and declaring them a prophecy of his praiſe, to be perfected by the mouths of babes and ſucklings; ſo that we find a prophecy, that the praiſe of the Lord, "who had ſet his glory above the heavens," Pſa. viii. 1. is declared to be fulfilled by the direction of praiſe and hoſannas to the Son of David, who muſt therefore be one with the Father, God, Mat. xxi. 16.

VIII.

"For thy ſake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as ſheep for the ſlaughter," Pſa. xliv. 22. Theſe words directly addreſſed to God, by David, are by St. Paul declared to be a prophecy of the perſeverance of the apoſtles in the love of Chriſt, of which he ſays, "Who ſhall ſeparate us from the love of Chriſt? ſhall tribulation, or diſtreſs, or perſecution, or famine, or nakedneſs, or peril, or ſword?" As it is written,

"for

" for thy ſake, &c." Rom. viii. 35. For whoſe ſake? certainly Chriſt's, one with the Father, God.

The prophecies afforded by the New Teſtament, I have already ſtated in the preceding chapter, and ſhall not trouble my reader with a repetition of them.

The following proofs are taken from the teſtimony borne to our bleſſed Lord's divinity in the writings of the four evangeliſts.

IX.

" Thy kingdom come," Matth. vi. 10. " Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen." Matth. vi. 13. That our Saviour's command to the diſciples, is to addreſs theſe words, and the prayer in which they occur, directly to God, is not only granted but contended for: but let us ſee now who is this God, who is this king of glory. " Then (in the laſt day) ſhall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they ſhall ſee the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he ſhall ſend his angels, &c." Matth. xxiv. 30, 31. " When the Son of man ſhall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then ſhall he ſit upon the throne of his glory. And before him ſhall be gathered all nations; and he ſhall ſeparate them one from another, as a ſhepherd divideth his ſheep from the goats; and he ſhall ſet the ſheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then ſhall the King ſay unto them on his right hand, come, ye bleſſed of my Father, &c." Mat. xxv. 31, 32, 33, 34. Here we ſee the coming of the kingdom, and we ſee alſo whoſe is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Wherefore then ſhould we ſay that Jeſus Chriſt, in preſcribing this form of prayer, forbad worſhip and application to be made to him, whom we find to be the very being deſcribed

deſcribed and pointed out as the proper object of our adoration? It is manifeſtly his command that we ſhould worſhip him; and hence it follows, that he is one with the Father, God Almighty. He ſays in another place, "whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and ſinful generation, of him alſo ſhall the Son of man be aſhamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels," Mark viii. 38. On which I remark, that the glory of the Father, and of the Son, is but one glory, one Godhead; for we ſee our bleſſed Lord coming in his own glory, and in the parallel paſſage, in the glory of his Father. The following texts evince this, and alſo aſcribe the kingdom and the glory to Jeſus Chriſt. "The Son of man ſhall ſend forth his angels, and they ſhall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity," Mat. xiii. 41. "The Son of man ſhall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he ſhall reward every man according to his works," Mat. xvi. 27. "Whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me and of my words, of him ſhall the Son of man be aſhamed, when he ſhall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and all the holy angels," Luke ix. 26. "No whoremonger, &c. hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Chriſt, and of God," Epheſ. v. 5. "Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom," 2 Tim. iv. 1. "The evelaſting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," 2 Pet i. 11. Our Saviour, in anſwer to the demand of the Phariſees, (Luke xvii. 20 to 30) "when the kingdom of God ſhould come," tells them, "the kingdom of God cometh not with obſervation;" or as it is tranſlated in the margin of the Bible, "with outward ſhow;" and then, addreſſing himſelf to his diſciples, continues to declare, that no prognoſticks ſhall foreſhew his day; but that,

as

as the flood was not preceded by any ſigns that it was at hand, but found men eating and drinking, and altogether unprepared, ſo ſhould it be " in the day when the Son of man is revealed." From the continuance of the diſcourſe, and applying ſtill the coming without obſervation, to the coming of the kingdom of God, and to his own day, which is often ſpoken of as ſynonimous with the day in which the Son of man ſhall come in power and glory, ſitting on the throne of his glory to judge the world, we may, without in the leaſt ſtraining for an inference, ſay, that the day of which he ſpeaks to the diſciples as coming unobſerved, and the kingdom of God, of which he aſſerts the ſame thing to the Phariſees in the ſame converſation, are one and the ſame thing; and if the day of Chriſt be the ſame as the kingdom of Chriſt, the kingdom of God is here declared to be the kingdom of Chriſt; therefore one with the Father, on that day, on the coming of that kingdom to be fully revealed to be God.

X.

The incomprehenſibility of the Father and the Son, except to each other, is a mark of equality of Godhead, which alone can be the ſubject of the following words of our Saviour himſelf. " No man knoweth the Son but the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father, ſave the Son, and he to whomſoever the Son will reveal him," Matth. xi. 27. Many a man had known Jeſus Chriſt as Man; but as God, he was known then to the Father only, with whom he was one God. The parallel paſſage ſays, " No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father, &c." Luke x. 22. Mr. Lindſey ſays he does, but I cannot think it. How ſhall he, who is known by all his diſciples to be a man, ſay he is unknown to all but the Father, if he ſpeak not of a nature not human, and of ſo high a rank as to be comprehenſible to the Father only, even his Godhead?

When

XI.

When our bleſſed Lord, juſt before he aſcended into heaven, was ſending forth his diſciples to baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, and to teach them to obſerve all things which he had commanded them, he gives them a promiſe of his own aſſiſtance in the performance of their miſſion, ſaying, "And, lo! I am with you alway even unto the end of the world," Matth. xxviii. 20. We accordingly find that, upon his aſcent, "they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with ſigns following," Mark xvi. 20. "How then ſhall we eſcape if we neglect ſo great ſalvation, which at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God alſo bearing them witneſs, both with ſigns and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, according to his own will?" Heb. ii. 3, 4. Here we find that the teſtimony of ſigns and miracles wrought to confirm what is preached by the apoſtles, is borne by God, and by the Lord Chriſt, therefore one, with the Father, God.

XII.

It is evident what was the faith of the father of the ſick child, who "cried out, and ſaid with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief," Mark ix. 24. So ſtrong was his faith already, that he looked upon our Lord as poſſeſſed of power to aſſiſt his ſpirit, and ſupply whatſoever was defective in his belief. This application was approved and confirmed to be right by our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, who granted the diſtreſſed father's prayer, and healed his ſick child.

XIII.

Upon hearing Jeſus Chriſt ſay to the ſick of the palſy, "Man, thy ſins are forgiven thee," I cannot wonder at the remark of the Scribes, who ſaid, "Who can

forgive ſins but God alone? For their law had ſhewed them that God had made an excluſive claim to the forgiveneſs of ſins, ſaying, "I, even I am he that blotteth out thy tranſgreſſions for mine own ſake, and will not remember thy ſins," Iſai. xliii. 25. But our Saviour perceived their thoughts, and healed the ſick man, in order to ſhew "that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive ſins," Luke v. 20, 25. But God, whom Nehemiah, ix. 17, beautifully, calls "a God of pardons," has an excluſive right in the forgiveneſs of ſins; the Son of man who exerciſes that right, even Jeſus Chriſt, is therefore one with the Father, God.

XIV.

"Bleſſed are ye when men ſhall hate you, and when they ſhall ſeparate you from their company, and ſhall reproach you, and caſt out your name as evil, for the Son of man's ſake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for behold your reward is great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets," Luke vi. 22, 23. If the happineſs of the diſciples, to whom our Saviour addreſſes the words above, be not to proceed from the reproach, but from the cauſe wherefore they are to undergo it, there is no ſimilitude between their caſe and that of the prophets, unleſs the prophets alſo ſuffered for the ſake of the Son of man, and for the teſtimony which they bore to him; and that this was really the intention of our Lord's words, the following text, ſpoken by St. Stephen, will evince, "Which of the prophets have not your fathers perſecuted? And they have ſlain them which ſhewed before of the coming of the juſt one; of whom ye have now been the betrayers and murderers," Acts vii. 52. Stephen was, at the time when he uttered theſe words, under the perſecution which our Saviour had foretold to his diſciples that they ſhould ſuſtain for his ſake; he therefore reflected on the circumſtance pointed out by him,

him, as a means of happineſs and bleſſing, in their afflictions, and conſidered that, with the prophets, he was "a partaker of Chriſt's ſufferings; that when his glory ſhall be revealed, he might be glad alſo with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Chriſt, happy are ye; for the Spirit of glory, and of God reſteth upon you: on their part he is evil ſpoken of, but on your part he is glorified," 1 Pet. iv. 13, 14. Let us juſt turn then to the relation of the ſufferings of this authentic martyr of Chriſt, and ſee whether, upon the reproach incurred for his ſake, the glory of God, and of Jeſus ſitting at his right hand, was not revealed to him; and whether the Spirit, which proceeds from the one glory, the one Godhead of the Father and the Son, did not reſt upon him, even the Holy Ghoſt, with which he was comforted, and by which he cried, "Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit," Acts vii. 51 to 59.

XV.

"Jeſus ſent him away, ſaying, Return to thine own houſe, and ſhew how great things God hath done unto thee. And he went his way, and publiſhed throughout the whole city, how great things Jeſus had done unto him," Luke viii. 38, 39. According to a command, to ſhew what God had done, the man who had been healed teſtified what Jeſus had done. I do not look upon the evidence of this man as of any great weight in the argument; but there is certainly ſome teſtimony borne to our Saviour's divinity, by the manner in which the fact is related by an apoſtle filled with the Holy Ghoſt, for the purpoſe of preaching Chriſt with preciſion, and who has, nevertheleſs, repeated the ſame words concerning the name of God and of Jeſus Chriſt. It is ſomewhat remarkable alſo, that in the relation of the ſame fact made by St. Mark, the command to the man is ſaid to have been, "go home

to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee," Mark v. 19; and the man's publication is exactly as related by St. Luke, " how great things Jesus had done for him." The title of Lord is so very often, nay, so almost peculiarly ascribed to our Saviour, throughout the New Testament, that the use of it here seems an argument for looking upon our blessed Redeemer to have been intended by it: if Jesus Christ then be the Lord intended here, and that the title of Lord be of the same import as the name of " God," for which it is used by St. Mark, then we must acknowledge, that Christ is the Lord, and the Lord he is God. There is a farther circumstance favouring the position that Jesus Christ is the person named here by the appellations of Lord and God, which is, that the man whom he had healed is desired to add to a declaration of what the Lord had done for him, " that he had compassion on him," which certainly must bear reference to that tenderness with which he felt our infirmities, that sympathy with which " Jesus wept," John xi. 35, for the afflictions of those who called upon him even at the moment that he was in act to wipe away the tears from their eyes.

XVI.

I should not look upon the application of the dying thief to our Saviour, hanging also upon a cross, to be any proof that Jesus Christ is the object of prayer, but for the answer made by him, who immediately granted that which was asked, and by admission into paradise, in consequence of a petition preferred to him in an hour, when, of all others, he seemed least able to assist in the time of trouble, exalted the last words of this poor penitent into an incontrovertible testimony that his is the kingdom, that " by suffering he was about to enter into his glory," and that

that he is therefore the Lord, one with the Father, God, Luke xxiii. 42, 43, and xxiv. 26.

XVII.

" Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto them, deſtroy this temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up," in ſaying which " he ſpake of the temple of his body," John ii. 19, 21. Here Jeſus Chriſt declares that he will himſelf raiſe his body from the grave; but in the grave that body lay truly dead and incapable of any agency: but here he ſays, that he will act, he muſt therefore ſpeak of ſome very extraordinary power remaining to him. But we are often told, that God raiſed the body of our Saviour from the grave. " This Jeſus hath God raiſed up," ſays St. Peter, Acts ii. 32; wherein it is obſervable, that the union of the two natures being ſuſpended during the death of the body, God is ſpoken of as diſtinct from Jeſus, whoſe body only is intended by that name: this diſtinction Peter ſeems to have had in view throughout the Acts. That which Chriſt engaged to do, moſt aſſuredly he did. He engaged to raiſe his own body, therefore he did raiſe his own body. But " this Jeſus hath God raiſed up." Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, God.

XVIII.

" Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto her, If thou knoweſt the gift of God, and who it is that ſaith to thee, give me to drink; then wouldeſt thou have aſked of him, and he would have given thee living water," John iv. 10. " Whoſoever drinketh of the water which I ſhall give him, ſhall never thirſt," John iv. 14. Here Jeſus Chriſt gives the gift of God, more properly the gift of Jeſus Chriſt, who gives it, and only reconcilable to ſenſe, by acknowledging him to be one with the Father, God. " They have forſaken the Lord, the fountain of living waters," Jer. xvii. 13.

" And

"And he ſhewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as chryſtal, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb," Rev. xxii. 1. "Let him that is athirſt, come: and whoſoever will, let him take of the water of life freely," Rev. xxii. 17. This invitation ſo mercifully made to all mankind, and in the power of all to accept, is made by Jeſus Chriſt; he therefore who gives ſuch "water ſpringing up into everlaſting life," John iv. 14, is aſſuredly the "Lord, the fountain of living waters;" which Jeremiah declares God to be. "Ho! every one that thirſteth, come ye to the waters," Iſai. lv. 1; "for I will pour water upon him that is thirſty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my ſpirit upon thy ſeed, and my bleſſing upon thine offspring," Iſai. xliv. 3. "Jeſus ſtood and cried, ſaying, If any man thirſt, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the ſcripture hath ſaid, out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living water. (But this he ſpake of the ſpirit, which they that believe on him ſhould receive,") John vii. 37, 38. This laſt text clears up and explains the figure, and ſhews what is all along meant by living waters. But "God ſhall pour his ſpirit upon him that is thirſty;" and according to this prophecy, Jeſus Chriſt is to give this water ſpringing up into life, which is the ſpirit. But theſe waters are ſaid to proceed from God; Jeſus Chriſt therefore, from whom they proceed, is one with the Father, God. Let us then with gratitude come upon the invitation to believe; let us confeſs that the blood which was ſhed for us is the blood of God himſelf, Acts xx. 28, ſhed for our redemption; acknowledge "Chriſt the Saviour of the world," John iv. 42, and "with joy draw water out of the wells of ſalvation," Iſai. xii. 3.

"My

XIX.

" My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews ſought the more to kill him, becauſe he not only had broken the ſabbath, but ſaid alſo that God was his Father, making himſelf equal with God, John v. 17, 18. As the Hebrew idiom of the ſcripture language is urged as a reaſon for doubting of our common acceptation of the aſſertions made in the New Teſtament, we muſt certainly admit the Jews to be the beſt verbal interpreters of ſuch phraſes as were peculiar to themſelves, and here they have taught us to underſtand that whenſoever our Saviour, or any witneſs of his goſpel, declares him to be the Son of God, they intended thereby to convey an aſſurance that Jeſus Chriſt is equal with the Father, and with him one God. The ſubſequent verſes ſay that " what thing ſoever the Father doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe." " As the Father hath life in himſelf: ſo hath he given to the Son to have life in himſelf; and hath given him authority to execute judgment alſo, becauſe he is the Son of man," John v. 26, 27. Here he ſpeaks of himſelf both as God and man; he declares the ſelf-exiſting life equal with that of the Father; declares the derivation of that to his manhood, with which it was united by the will of God and the Father; and he declares alſo the reaſon wherefore the ſecond perſon of the Godhead is to have the execution of judgment to be, " becauſe he is the Son of man." And St. Paul has explained the force of this reaſon, " for that he himſelf hath ſuffered, being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted," Heb. ii. 18. " That he can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; having been in all points tempted like as we are," Heb. iv. 15; and in the next verſe we

are

are called upon to approach the throne of grace boldly, becauſe that Chriſt is the Son of man, having taken on him the ſeed of Abraham, and has called us brethren, and can have compaſſion upon ſuch infirmities as he was himſelf ſubject to in the fleſh: ſo that whenſoever we hear our gracious Lord and Saviour call himſelf the Son of man, we may look upon it as an inſtance of tenderneſs, and that he uſes that name, in order to inſpire a confidence in mankind, his brethren, to approach his throne without diſtruſt in his mercy. Whenſoever he ſpeaks of coming to judgment, he qualifies the terrors of that dreadful day by ſaying, that it is before the Son of man that all nations are to be gathered; and in the paſſage before us, declares the reaſon wherefore all judgment is committed to the Son to be, becauſe he is the Son of man. Our Saviour, after having ſaid that "the Father quickeneth the dead," John v. 21, proceeds to tell us, that on that day "the dead ſhall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear ſhall live," John v. 25. And farther, that "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves ſhall hear his (the Son of man's) voice," John v. 28: ſo that here, they that are in their graves, live, being called upon by the Son of man, becauſe they have heard the voice of the Son of God, the Father being he who quickeneth the dead. Can this be reconciled to any ſenſe, if it be not granted that Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and alſo the Son of man, is equal to, and one with the Father, God? And this once granted, is any poſition more reconcilable to reaſon? Reſiſt this who can, for my part I am unable to ſtand againſt it; but verily "believe, and am ſure that thou art that Chriſt, the Son of the living God," John vi. 69; words, which I am bold to uſe, as expreſſive of an equality between

tween the Son and the Father: nay farther, of an identity and unity of Godhead. As poſſeſſed of this Godhead "I believe on him, and I worſhip him," John ix. 38.

XX.

"He that believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life, and ſhall not come into condemnation," John v. 24. "He that believeth on him, (the Son) is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, becauſe he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God," John iii. 18. If there be no condemnation for thoſe who believe in the Father, how is it neceſſary to believe in the Son in order to indemnify? It can only be ſo, becauſe that the Son is one with the Father, God; and the two paſſages then convey the ſame inſtruction. In context with the laſt aſſertion, our Saviour, ſpeaking of himſelf, uſes the following very remarkable words, "the Son of man which is in heaven," John iii. 13. This is a very expreſs declaration of his Godhead, the ubiquity of which was by no means affected by its union with the Son of man; for whilſt he was ſpeaking to Nicodemus he could be on earth only as a man, and as God only filling immenſity could he at that moment of time have been in heaven. He declares alſo, that "he came down from heaven," in the ſame verſe; and St. John Baptiſt, ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt, teſtifies, that "he that cometh from above is above all," John iii. 31. The pre-exiſtence of our Lord in heaven is expreſsly declared by himſelf in the following words alſo, "What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of man aſcend up where he was before?" John vi. 62. This muſt refer to his Godhead, as it is no where aſſerted that his fleſhly body had ever been in heaven before his final aſcent. But when he declares, "I came forth from

 the

the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father," " his disciples said unto him, lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb," John xvi. 28, 29.

XXI.

" Jesus said unto them, verily verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am," John viii. 58. There is a very remarkable distinction in this passage between the words *was* and *am*. By the former, the existence of Abraham is marked to have had a commencement, and to have been finite; whereas, by the latter, the eternity of Jesus Christ, as God, is strongly pointed out. The word *am* bears reference to a life in every moment extended to all eternity; which, as the presence of the Almighty fills infinite space, stretches itself at once through all duration, and is at all periods to be spoken of in the present tense, as all periods are present to it at once; a life " which is, and which was, and which is to come," Rev. i. 4. Jesus Christ here makes use of the same expression which God had declared to be his name to Moses, and given to him as a token whereby he should make himself known to the children of Israel, to have come from God, Exod. iii. 14; and it can hardly be conceived that he does so without an intention of marking his divinity, and declaring himself to be that God, and that he it was who led the forefathers of those with whom he spoke, out of the land of Egypt by the hand of Moses. In some passages, ending in a declaration, " *I am* " in the original, the translation has supplied the word *he*; because a relative pronoun, the expression of which the Greek tongue can dispense with, is necessarily to be expressed in ours, in order to make good sense of the passage in English, which is good sense in Greek without it. For instance: the woman of Samaria tells our Saviour, that

that "when Chriſt comes, he will tell us all things:" to which he anſwered, "I that ſpeak unto thee, am," John iv. 26; ſo it ſtands in the original, and requires no more words to convey the idea that he was Chriſt of whom ſhe ſpake; whereas it is indiſpenſibly requiſite that the tranſlator ſhall add a pronoun referring to what had been ſaid before, and turn the paſſage, as our Bible has it, "I that ſpeak unto thee am *he*." From this circumſtance it is urged, that no inference, favouring our Saviour's divinity, is to be drawn from the paſſage before us, becauſe (as is alledged) it is only of the ſame ſtamp of the others. Without going farther into grammatical diſquiſitions, let us try the experiment upon it, and write it accordingly, "Jeſus ſaid unto them, verily verily I ſay unto you, before Abraham was, I am *he*." Who? Abraham? Will any man inſiſt on this? The word *am* in this verſe ſignifies, I exiſt, in a neuter ſenſe, and ſo cannot require a relative pronoun to follow it. The context alſo requires the interpretation which I have put upon theſe words; our Saviour declares to the Jews, "I am," in anſwer to their objection to the poſſibility of his having ſeen Abraham, not being yet fifty years old. Upon the whole, I look upon this to be a very explicit declaration of his Godhead and pre-exiſtence to the time of his having come into the world, a teſtimony borne to it by the author of our ſalvation himſelf, and therefore I muſt yield my aſſent to his word, that he is one with the Father, God.

XXII.

"I and my Father are one," John x. 30. When our Saviour made this very literal declaration, the Jews ſtoned him, and gave as a reaſon, "becauſe that thou, being a man, makeſt thyſelf God," John x. 33. This ſhews how they underſtood him; and

the anſwer of our Saviour to their charge ſhews alſo that they were right, for, inſtead of retracting, he refers them to the teſtimony of his works; "that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him," John x. 38: words, which, however they might admit of a figurative interpretation in any other paſſage, being here ſpoke to confirm what he had before declared, muſt be interpreted by that declaration, and mark a mutual relation, reſulting only from the poſſeſſion of one Godhead with the Father.

XXIII.

"Philip ſaith unto him, Lord, ſhew us the Father, and it ſufficeth us. Jeſus ſaith unto him, have I been ſo long with you, and yet haſt thou not known me, Philip? He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father: and how ſayeſt thou then, ſhew us the Father? Believeſt thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of myſelf: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or elſe believe me for the very works ſake," John xiv. 8, 9, 10, 11. The interpretation of this paſſage may be drawn from the remark made upon the texts laſt cited, for our Saviour teſtifies, that he is in the Father, and the Father in him, in order to evince, that Philip, in having known him, had known the Father. As our Lord could not mean that Philip's acquaintance with the Father was the ſame as his acquaintance with himſelf, in the fleſh, he has pointed out, that the means whereby he had known the Father, in having known him, was by his knowledge of thoſe words which he had ſpoken, and thoſe works which he had done by the operation of his Godhead,

head, one with that of the Father. Theſe had been often cognizable by Philip; he therefore in having known the Son, who had ſaid and done ſuch things in teſtimony of what he was, might well be ſaid to have known the Father, with whom our Lord and Saviour was, in that reſpect which was pointed out, one and the ſame God.

XXIV.

"I go unto my Father. And whatſoever ye ſhall aſk in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye ſhall aſk any thing in my name, I will do it," John xiv. 12, 13, 14. I believe no man will deny that a petition is to be made to him who is to grant it. Jeſus Chriſt here declares to his diſciples, that he will fulfil their prayers, and do that which they ſhall aſk in his name; who then can heſitate to pronounce this doctrine of our Saviour a command to aſk of him, a declaration that he is the God of our ſalvation, from whom cometh help? "With Melancthon, (as quoted by Mr. Lindſey, but for what purpoſe I cannot comprehend) I take refuge in thoſe plain declarations of ſcripture, which injoin prayer to Chriſt, which is to aſcribe the proper honour of divinity to him, and is full of conſolation." And with Mr. Lindſey himſelf I obſerve, 1ſt, that this eminent perſon thought, and juſtly as it ſhould ſeem, that prayer is the higheſt act of worſhip, the proper honour of God, and peculiar to him alone. And, 2dly, that the principal argument for Chriſt's divinity was to be fetched from religious worſhip, and prayer being addreſſed to him." Apology, p. 135. Mr. Lindſey's candour is ſuch that I rely upon his not ſtarting from this concluſion, which he admits as neceſſarily following from Chriſt's being proved the object of prayer and religious worſhip. I ſhall therefore, if the above texts afford a proof,

proof, or many others, which I ſhall call up in evidence of this fact, teſtify that Chriſt is properly to be adored, demand and peremptorily inſiſt upon Mr. Lindſey's acquieſcence in this poſition, that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God. It is a certain fact, even upon a ſuppoſition that our Saviour was no more than man, that he was "without ſin," and, conſequently, that he did not in any inſtance contradict himſelf, whereby he muſt have once ſpoken that which was not true; but he ſays to his diſciples, "And in that day ye ſhall aſk me nothing: verily verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye ſhall aſk the Father in my name, he will give it you;" John xvi. 23. As our bleſſed Redeemer cannot mean here to ſay that he had before ſpoken an untruth, theſe words muſt have exactly the ſame meaning as thoſe before us; for, if not, they flatly contradict them. That I will grant your prayers, and that the Father will grant your prayers, muſt therefore ſignify that the one Godhead of the Father and the Son will grant them; and therefore it follows, that the Father and the Son are one God. "If ye ſhall aſk any thing, in my name, I will do it," ſays our Saviour; whence I have inferred, that he it is of whom the demand is to be made: But I foreſee a poſſible objection to be made to this inference, which I ſhall endeavour to obviate. It is, that in this caſe Jeſus Chriſt has commanded prayer to be preferred to himſelf in his own name; to which I anſwer, that ſo to have done is exactly correſpondent to the conduct of God, ſo long as he had a ſelected nation his worſhippers, and dealt by them as a peculiar people to call upon his name; and that therefore, when they were to ceaſe to be peculiar, and that a whole world was to be adopted, there is no force in the objection, which only ſhews God governing his additional adorers, as he had governed their predeceſſors,

Before

Before God was to be adored through Chriſt, he was to be adored through thoſe benefits which he had conferred upon the children of Iſrael; before the name of Chriſt was given, through which he was to be invoked, his innumerable mercies were commanded to be held in remembrance, and in the name of them he was to be called upon; and accordingly we find the Hebrews adored him as the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of their fathers, to whom he had promiſed, and frequently renewed the promiſe of a bleſſing to proceed from them to all nations of the earth. They adored him as the God of their fathers, who had led them out of the houſe of bondage into a land flowing with milk and honey; and, as the God who had dealt thus graciouſly by them, he preſcribed to them, and prefaced the decalogue with a claim to their obedience, and to their worſhipping him only, grounded upon that debt of gratitude, which they owed for the protection and deliverance that he had vouchſafed them; and he has expreſsly commanded them to call upon him as the God of their fathers, and made this "his name for ever, and his memorial unto all generations," Exod. iii. 15. But he has ſince been pleaſed to hold out a light to lighten the Gentiles, and, remembering his mercies, hath holpen his ſervant Iſrael, according to his promiſes; wherefore then ſhall we refrain from offering up the ſacrifice of praiſe and thankſgiving to God, in the name of his mercies vouchſafed to us by his having taken our nature upon him? in the name of that man in whoſe fleſh he was manifeſted *, and in which our eyes have ſeen, and our hands have handled the word of † life; even that word which is ‡ God? Wherefore, in remembrance of ſo great benefits, ſhould we not ſay,

* 1 Tim. iii. 16. † 1 John i. 1. ‡ John i. 1.

ſay, " by thine agony and bloody ſweat, by thy croſs and paſſion, by thy precious death and burial, by thy glorious reſurrection and aſcenſion, good Lord deliver us?" The ſenſe, in which I underſtand the words calling upon God in the name of Chriſt, is calling upon God to aſſiſt us, whom he had already thought worthy of ſo great benefits, in memory of thoſe benefits which he ſuffered in the fleſh, in order to confer. And ſurely in this ſenſe, it is perfectly conformable to the courſe of God's government, that our Saviour ſhould deſire us to call upon his Godhead in memory of what he has done for us as man, having already declared that he had, in remembrance of his former mercies, holpen us.

XXV.

" It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will ſend him unto you," John xvi. 7. " The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have ſaid unto you," John xiv. 26. Here Jeſus Chriſt ſends the Holy Ghoſt, and the Father at the ſame time ſends the Holy Ghoſt; therefore the Father and the Son are one God, from whom the ſpirit is to proceed. He ſays in another paſſage, " but when the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtify of me," John xv. 26. The Holy Ghoſt here proceedeth from the Father only; we find that the ſame witneſs of Chriſt preceded his coming, and teſtified of him beforehand, as well as after his aſcent; " For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt," 2 Peter i. 21. But we find the prophets themſelves, who ſpake as they were

were moved by the Holy Ghoſt, " ſearching what, or what manner of time the ſpirit of Chriſt which was in them did ſignify, when it teſtified beforehand the ſufferings of Chriſt, and the glory that ſhould follow," 1 Pet. i. 11; ſo that the apoſtles, filled with the Holy Ghoſt, have here expreſsly declared what glory that is which ſhould be teſtified after the ſufferings of Chriſt, even that the ſpirit which proceedeth from the Father is the ſpirit of Chriſt, therefore one with the Father, God. But our Saviour himſelf, as if determined to put the matter out of doubt, by preparing the ears of his audience to hear the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt concerning him, declares that " he ſhall glorify me: for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you. All things that the Father hath, are mine: therefore ſaid I, that he ſhall take of mine, and ſhew it unto you," John xvi. 14, 15.

XXVI.

Our bleſſed Lord and Saviour, having taken our nature upon him, and having been in all points tempted like as we are, on the approach of that hour in which he was to be made perfect by ſuffering death for all men, and in which he was to finiſh the great end of his having come in the fleſh, conſoles himſelf by looking beyond his grave, and contemplating the glory that ſhould follow; and as a man about to endure great afflictions, and, ſurmounting them, to take our nature " into heaven itſelf, now to appear in the preſence of God for us," Heb. ix. 24. addreſſes himſelf to that Being to which, as Man, he was inferior, ſaying, " Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son alſo may glorify thee," John xvii. 1. " And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," John xvii. 5. " For thou lovedſt me before the foundations of the world," John xvii. 24. The pre-exiſtence

of our Saviour is expreſsly declared here, and the identity of that Godhead with which he and the Father are mutually to glorify each other; that glory which the Son had in all reſpects equal with the Father, before he had, for the ſake of mankind, taken upon him that nature whereby he was, upon earth, inferior to him.

XXVII.

"Pilate therefore ſaid unto him, art thou a king then? Jeſus anſwered, thou ſayeſt that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cauſe came I into the world, that I ſhould bear witneſs unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth, heareth my voice," John xviii. 37. Theſe words are preceded by a declaration made by our Saviour, that, "my kingdom is not of this world;" and the whole together is ſaid by St. Paul to be "a good confeſſion witneſſed before Pilate," 1 Tim. vi. 13. That Nathanael, an Iſraelite indeed, in whom was no guile, underſtood the prophecies of our Saviour's kingdom in this ſenſe is evident, for, upon ſeeing him an unattended man, he pronounced him "the King of Iſrael," which he muſt have ſeen that he was not in any other acceptation of the terms than as he was the "Son of God," John i. 49. and this interpretation he put upon the prophecies, upon ſeeing our Saviour poſſeſſed of an extraordinary knowledge. Greater things have been reſerved for us to ſee than Nathanael ſaw; why then ſhall we heſitate to ſay, according to the teſtimony which this great witneſs of the truth bore to himſelf, "thy kingdom is not of this world," and with Nathanael, "thou art the King of Iſrael, the Son of God;" words which I have already ſhewed, when ſpoken by a Jew, to mean, thou haſt equality of Godhead with the Father.

"And

XXVIII.

" And Thomas anſwered and ſaid unto him, my Lord, and my God. Jeſus ſaith unto him, Thomas, becauſe thou haſt ſeen me, thou haſt believed," John xx. 28, 29. To call this ſaying of Thomas an exclamation, is a poor and diſingenuous evaſion of the Biſhop, quoted by Mr. Lindſey; for it is declared to be *an anſwer* and *an addreſs* to our Saviour, who had convinced him that he was the ſame Jeſus who had been dead and was alive again; an argument which I ſhould conceive ſufficient to evince the truth of doctrines which Thomas had heard before, but through a defective faith did not underſtand; and to induce that confeſſion which he now makes, ſaying unto him, " my Lord and my God." When Mary, ver. 16, ſaw and knew our Lord after his reſurrection, ſhe made no exclamation, but directly addreſſed herſelf to him, ſaying, " Maſter," acknowledging him to whom ſhe ſpoke. Mary had not been a witneſs of all the declarations of his own nature which he had made to his apoſtles, who were to be witneſſes unto him; ſhe acknowledges him as ſhe had known him before; but Thomas, who conſidered a reſurrection from the dead to be a concluſive proof of the truth of what he had often heard, inſtantly draws the natural inference, and acknowledges him to be his Lord and his God. If the works of this biſhop of *Mopſueſtia*, which have not reached us, be of the ſame ſtamp as the fragment quoted by Mr. Lindſey, we have no great reaſon to regret the loſs, or condemn our anceſtors for having conſigned the reſt of them to oblivion. The poor biſhop himſelf muſt alſo be obliged to thoſe who have redeemed him from our cenſure.———

Next in order follows the teſtimony borne to the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt by the apoſtles, men appointed to be his witneſſes, on whom " he breathed and ſaid,"

" receive ye the Holy Ghoſt," " the ſpirit of truth, he will guide you into all truth ;" " he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have ſaid unto you ;" " he will ſhew you things to come ; he ſhall glorify me." Men, " whoſe underſtanding he opened that they might underſtand the ſcriptures," " holy men of God who have made known unto us the power and coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, for they were eye-witneſſes of his Majeſty." To perſons thus qualified, ſpeaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt, coming in due time to ſpeak of him who had given himſelf a ranſom for all, " underſtanding the myſtery of Chriſt, which in other ages was not made known unto men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apoſtles and prophets by the Spirit ;" taking the prophecies from a dark place to ſpread abroad their radiance, and render their ſure word a light to us ; to ſuch men we ſhall do well that we take heed ; to their teſtimony it is eſſential to our own eternal happineſs that we give credit, and not that we look upon all ſuch things as occur in their writings, which are " hard to be underſtood, as given to our ignorance and inſtability to wreſt to our own deſtruction ;" they have pointed out the way to a bleſſed immortality ; it is our duty to ſearch into what they have ſaid, and where we cannot underſtand to confide. From the apoſtles we are to expect the manifeſtation of ſpiritual things, and as ſuch are certainly beyond the reach of our farther enquiry, it is but reaſonable to truſt thoſe who were permitted to look into them, and to promulgate ſo much as concerns us to know.

XXIX.

" And they prayed, and ſaid, thou Lord, which knoweſt the hearts of all men, ſhew whether of theſe two thou haſt choſen, that he may take part of this miniſtry and apoſtleſhip," Acts i. 24. This prayer

is

is preferred to the Lord who had ſent forth his diſciples, ſaying, " ye ſhall bear witneſs, becauſe ye have been with me from the beginning," John xv. 27. " Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature," Mark xvi. 15; and by whom, St. Paul ſays, " we have received the apoſtleſhip," Rom. i. 5; to that Lord, who knew to whom he ſhould commit himſelf, " becauſe he knew all men, and needed not that any ſhould teſtify of man; for he knew what was in man," John ii. 25. And the petition is that out of two men, namely, Juſtus and Matthias, ſelected from thoſe " who had been with our Saviour from the beginning," " which have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jeſus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptiſm of John, unto that ſame day that he was taken up from us," Acts i. 21, 22; he ſhould ordain one to be a witneſs of his reſurrection in the place of Judas, who had fallen by tranſgreſſion. That it is addreſſed to Jeſus Chriſt, not only the context, but the following circumſtance may thoroughly demonſtrate: The very ſame call being to be made of another apoſtle, as the Lord is now deſired to make, a light ſhone from heaven round about Saul, and of the voice which ſpoke it is thus declared: " the Lord ſaid, I am Jeſus whom thou perſecuteſt:" " and the Lord ſaid, ariſe, and go into the city, and it ſhall be told thee what thou muſt do," Acts ix. 5, 6. But when Saul, according to this commandment, came into Damaſcus, " he is met and received by a certain diſciple named Ananias, to whom ſaid the Lord in a viſion, Ananias. And he ſaid, behold I am here, Lord. I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy ſaints at Jeruſalem: and here he hath authority from the Chief Prieſts, to bind all *that call upon thy name*. But the Lord ſaid unto him, go thy way:

way: for he is a *chosen* vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and Kings, and the children of Israel," Acts ix. 13, 14, 15. That the vessel which was to bear the name of Christ before the Gentiles, &c. was to be chosen by him is here evident; and St. Paul himself farther says, "Christ sent me (not to baptize, but) to preach the gospel," 1 Cor. i. 17. To him who was to *choose*, it is therefore to be concluded the petition was preferred that he would shew whether of these two he had *chosen* to preach his gospel, and take part of that ministry to which "the wisdom of God," Luke xi. 49, even "Christ," Mat. xxiii. 34; said, "I will send them prophets and apostles:" so that here is an instance of adoration incontrovertibly offered up to Jesus Christ; therefore one with the Father, God, the proper object of prayer and religious worship.

But, throughout the relation, there is a farther testimony to be found of the adoration of Jesus Christ; for Ananias, himself a disciple, declares, that Saul was a persecutor of those *who called upon the name of Christ*, and "the disciples of our Saviour were therefore afraid of him when he assayed to join himself unto them," Acts ix. 26; for "all that heard him preach Christ in the synagogues were amazed, and said, is not this he that destroyed them which *called on this name* in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent, that he might bring them bound to the Chief Priests?" Acts ix. 20, 21. We have here direct proof that the disciples of Christ called upon his name, both from those who did, and those who did not call upon it.

I shall in this place take notice of Mr. Lindsey's assertion, (supported by quotations from various authors) that to call upon the name of Jesus is the same as to be

be called by the name of Jeſus, or to have the name of Jeſus called upon the ſubject ſpoken of. This declaration he has made in his very extraordinary comment upon 1 Cor. i. 2. Apology, p. 132. And he farther declares, that Stephen's calling upon the name of Jeſus, is the only paſſage in which theſe words mean directly the ſame as invoking him. Notwithſtanding that the name of that great critick in the Greek language, Dr. Clarke, is produced in evidence of this aſſertion, I own I am not convinced of its truth; nor can I ſee a reaſon why the identical word, ſignifying an invocation in one place, ſhall be denied to have the ſame ſignification in another, where the context is exactly ſimilar to that in which it is allowed to have that meaning, and indeed in which it requires to be ſo interpreted, in order to its bearing any meaning at all. But, with reſpect to the paſſage before us, it is a little remarkable that the name of Chriſt had not yet been called upon his diſciples, and that for want of a name to comprehend them all, the commiſſion to Saul is couched in the following aukward terms: "that if he found *any of this way*, he might bring them bound unto Jeruſalem," Acts ix. 2. In the execution of this warrant from the prieſts it was, that Saul was choſen to bear *the name* of Jeſus Chriſt to the Gentiles; and this happened exactly two years after the aſcenſion of our Saviour, whereas it was not till ten years after that event that the diſciples were firſt called chriſtians at Antioch. How diſingenuouſly then do men deal, not only with the world, but with themſelves alſo, in wreſting words from their true meaning, to the ſupport of their own ſuggeſtions. If one man, filled with the Holy Ghoſt for the purpoſe of "guiding him into all truth," has invoked Jeſus Chriſt, is not ſuch an act, once ſo performed, ſufficient to evince the propriety of the invocation, and to eſtabliſh the right of Jeſus

ſus Chriſt to be invoked? And if adoration then be the due of Chriſt, why ſhould we deny a literal interpretation to words by which it is aſſerted, that the diſciples of our Lord rendered him that praiſe and adoration to which he is entitled? Is it meant that the diſciples contradict the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt by which Stephen called upon the Lord Jeſus? They were themſelves filled with the Holy Ghoſt; and is the Spirit of Truth divided againſt himſelf? If this be the aſſertion, either Stephen, or the diſciples, or Dr. Clarke, or Mr. Lindſey, are guilty of an impious and abſurd blaſphemy, and I leave it to my reader to chooſe the blaſphemer. "He is a choſen veſſel unto me," ſays Jeſus Chriſt to Ananias, Acts ix. 15. "The God of our Fathers hath choſen thee," ſays Ananias to Saul, Acts xxii. 14. Who can now withhold the application of the following addreſs to the Lord Jeſus, or his concurrence with me in ſaying to him, "Lord thou art God."

There is yet another circumſtance in the paſſage before us, which proves that the prayer was addreſſed to Jeſus Chriſt. Peter, (who had, upon his own appointment to the miniſtry, taken our Lord to witneſs that he loved him, and would with fidelity diſcharge the truſt of feeding his ſheep committed to his keeping, ſaying, "Lord, thou knoweſt all things; thou knoweſt that I love thee," John xxi. 17.) was certainly the chief ſpeaker, and the perſon who preferred the prayer of this venerable aſſembly. It is therefore highly probable, that he who had accepted of his own apoſtleſhip with ſuch an acknowledgment of our Saviour's omniſcience, repeated the like acknowledgment when calling upon him to chooſe another to aſſociate with them, who ſhould alſo love him, and faithfully acquit himſelf of a part in the ſame apoſtleſhip. When Peter ſpoke

thoſe

thoſe words to Jeſus Chriſt in his own caſe, he certainly alluded to his knowledge of the heart, for "he was grieved;" and well he might upon recollection of the event which induced the declaration, for he had an aching memory of our Lord's more intimate knowledge of his own heart than he was himſelf poſſeſſed of, when upon his confidence of his own faith, ſaying, "I will lay down my life for thy ſake, Jeſus anſwered him, wilt thou lay down thy life for my ſake? verily verily I ſay unto thee, the cock ſhall not crow, till thou haſt denied me thrice," John xiii. 37, 38. This he knew to have been truly ſpoken by his Maſter, and for him, whoſe own particular experience had taught him that Jeſus Chriſt was acquainted with man, and needed not that any ſhould teſtify of man, it is exceedingly natural that he ſhould on ſuch an occaſion ſay to him "who knew all things," "Lord which knoweſt the hearts of all men, &c."

XXX.

When Peter and John had, "in the name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth," healed the lame man at the gate of the temple, the people who ſaw it ran together greatly wondering; "and when Peter ſaw it, he anſwered unto the people, ye men of Iſrael, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye ſo earneſtly on us, as though by our own power or holineſs we had made this man walk?" Acts iii. 12. "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Iſrael, that, by the name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raiſed from the dead, even by him doth this man ſtand here before you whole," Acts iv. 10. Upon which, the Rulers, having threatened Peter and John, were obliged to let them go, "for all men *glorified God* for that which was done," Acts iv. 21. Peter, when he reſtored Eneas to health at Lydda, called him from his

bed in the following remarkable terms: "Eneas, Jeſus Chriſt maketh thee whole: ariſe, and make thy bed," Acts ix. 34. He aroſe immediately, and the conſequence was, that "all that dwelt at Lydda, and Saron, ſaw him, and *turned to the Lord*," ver. 35.

XXXI.

"When they heard theſe things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnaſhed on him (Stephen) with their teeth. But he being full of the Holy Ghoſt looked up ſtedfaſtly into heaven, and ſaw the glory of God, and Jeſus ſtanding on the right hand of God, and ſaid, behold, I ſee the heavens opened, and the Son of man ſtanding on the right hand of God. Then they cried out with a loud voice, and ſtopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and caſt him out of the city, and ſtoned him: And the witneſſes laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whoſe name was Saul. And they ſtoned Stephen, calling upon *God*, and ſaying, Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this ſin to their charge," Acts vii. 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60.

Mr. Lindſey's remark upon this paſſage is ſo very particular, that I will give it at large, and then proceed to ſhew its futility to the very few of my readers, who ſhall not have found it out of themſelves. "There is no doubt but Stephen made this requeſt, addreſſed this prayer to the Lord Jeſus. But this can be no precedent for directing prayer to him *unſeen*, or addreſſing him as God, whom the bleſſed Martyr declares *he ſaw with his eyes*, and calls him "the Son of man ſtanding on the right hand of God." Calls him *the Son of man*, in this his higheſt ſtate of exaltation. *Son of man, and God moſt high: what a ſpace*

ſpace between?" Apology, p. 129. Does this gentleman conceive that the actions of an almighty God are circumſcribed by the limits appointed to his comprehenſion, that the ſpace beyond which his imagination cannot paſs, is equally an obſtruction to the will of him to whom "all things are poſſible," and that the Omnipotent is to pauſe in his progreſs, till Mr. Lindſey ſhall have leiſure to come up with him and mark his footſteps? I hope I have already evinced the abſurdity of this appeal from the written word to natural religion, and ſhewed that the ſcriptures only are the fountain from whence the courſe of our argument is to flow; they are granted to be true, and to be ultimate, and if from them I find that God has put his own nature into union with that of man, I will believe that he has done ſo; that he has formed us a creature, with whom it was poſſible for him who had "put all things into his own power" to come into union, notwithſtanding that neither Mr. Lindſey nor I know any thing of the manner. The ſpace between God and man may be utterly unſurmountable to our conceptions, but ſhall it therefore impede the Almighty? It is not reaſon which ſtands in the way of our belief, but the impious pride of ignorance, "ſpeaking evil of that which it underſtands not," "beguiling unſtable ſouls," "withdrawing from the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by which we had before eſcaped the pollutions of the world," 2 Peter. ii. Mr. Lindſey having allowed that "the principal argument for Chriſt's divinity is to be fetched from religious worſhip and prayer being addreſſed to him," Apology, p. 135, is moſt exceedingly diſtreſſed at the paſſage before us, and accordingly uſes his utmoſt diligence to extricate himſelf from the melancholy neceſſity of yielding up his ſpirit into the hands of his Redeemer, his Mediator, and his Judge; and left it ſhould

follow that he who " bought us with the price of his own blood," " and ſo loved us that he gave himſelf a ranſom for all," has any right in his purchaſe, or ſhould " in due time be teſtified," by the invocation of St. Stephen, to be one with the Father, God, recourſe is had to an expedient, the moſt ſingular perhaps that ever was made uſe of to any purpoſe whatſoever, and it is aſſerted that this firſt Martyr of our Saviour having *ſeen* the Lord Jeſus *with his eyes* when he prayed, affords no precedent for directing prayer to him *unſeen*. The very fact, as ſtated by Mr. Lindſey, is diſputable; for although it be ſaid that Stephen, while before the council, and under their diſpleaſure, ſo long as he looked up ſtedfaſtly into heaven ſaw Jeſus Chriſt, it by no means follows that the viſion continued, or that he could conveniently keep his eyes fixed ſtedfaſtly upon it at the time when they ran upon him, caſt him out of the city, and ſtoned him; that is, at the time when he called upon the Lord Jeſus. But I will, for argument's ſake, admit that Stephen ſtill continued to have his eyes upon him, and that, " being filled with the Holy Ghoſt, he *ſtill* ſaw the glory of God, and Jeſus Chriſt ſtanding at the right hand of God." Is not God himſelf here equally before the eyes of the bleſſed Martyr as the Son of man? why then ſhould his view of the one induce prayer more than his view of the other? Nay, wherefore ſhould he paſs down from God moſt high through that immenſe ſpace which lay between him and the Son of man, unleſs that, conducted by the Holy Ghoſt, ſent " to guide him into all truth," John xvi. 13. he ſaw that Father and Son were not one and another, but one and the ſame God, and that there was no ſpace between the Son of man and God moſt high? unleſs indeed he ſaw the Lord Jeſus, into whoſe hands he commended his ſpirit, to be the almighty God to whom David had ſaid " into thine hand

hand I commit my ſpirit: thou haſt redeemed me, O Lord God of truth?" Pſalm xxxi. 5. Will Mr. Lindſey perſiſt to ſay that the Holy Ghoſt had led him into error? and yet into an error he has led him, if Jeſus Chriſt, even in this his higheſt ſtate of exaltation, be but his fellow creature. But becauſe Jeſus was in ſight he was to be worſhipped; and there is nothing wrong in worſhipping a viſible creature. If the command be, and if the duty of a chriſtian therefore be to worſhip God only, I own myſelf too blind to diſcern how the viſibility of any Creature ſhould ſuperſede the commandment, and alter the unalterable law of God. The Angel was viſible to St. John, Rev. xxii. 9. yet reſtrained him from worſhip, which Chriſt did not do by his adorer; but he, who was equally viſible to Stephen as the Son of man, winked at the diſreſpect with which he paſſed by his own glory, and addreſſed himſelf to the Lord Jeſus; and by a diſplay of that glory teſtified in the higheſt his approbation of that addreſs which was preferred to the Son of man by this holy Martyr, "with the Spirit of Truth," as being conſiſtent with the command, as a direct obedience to his will declared in theſe words, "Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou worſhip." "Worſhip God," ſaid the Angel to St. John; our Saviour ſaid no ſuch thing to Stephen, nor referred him to that God whoſe glory was before his eyes. I therefore think it evident, that God, and God only, Stephen did worſhip, in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, one with the Father, God. I grant Mr. Lindſey's aſſertion, that the word "God" is ſupplied in the 59th verſe, "calling upon *God*, and ſaying Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit." It is of no conſequence if it be omitted, for then the invocation is made directly to Chriſt, and remains a proof that he is God, though he be not addreſſed by that name. The word "God" being inſerted by the tranſlators,

lators, ſhews how they underſtood the paſſage before us, and though I do not chooſe to make uſe of human authority, I cannot help this once ſaying that I look upon this concluſion, drawn by men of great abilities, and employed in the moſt diligent peruſal of the whole Bible, as more than a balance to every quotation produced by Mr. Lindſey from men purſuing ſyſtems, and wreſting half ſentences to their own particular purpoſes. Upon the whole, unleſs it be admitted that being viſible is a reaſon for addreſſing prayer to any thing we are looking at, here is an inſtance of adoration, a precedent of religious worſhip preferred to our Lord and Saviour, and, if "religious worſhip and prayer be a proof of Godhead," I demand Mr. Lindſey's acquieſcence in this concluſion, that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God; who has ſaid, "am I a God at hand, and not a God afar off?" Jer. xxiii. 23.

I mean now to reſume what for a time I admitted, that Stephen had Jeſus Chriſt before his eyes when he was caſt out of the city and ſtoned. The ſcriptures are ſeldom ſo vague as to require our belief of that which is not particularly revealed. The ſtar which appeared to the wiſe men is never withdrawn from before their eyes till it ſtood over the houſe where the young child was. The evangeliſt has conſtantly kept it in view, whereas there is no mention made that the heavens continued open to Stephen, from the time he was taken from before the council; and therefore we have no reaſon to affirm that they did. The very prayers which our Lord and Saviour, ſuffering in the fleſh, preferred, are preferred by Stephen, who therefore muſt be aware of the force of example; or, if not ſo acute himſelf, muſt have known by the Spirit of Truth that future times would refer themſelves to the conduct of this martyr; and that men, like him, in articulo mortis, would

would commend their ſpirit to the Lord Jeſus. Did the ſpirit mean to deceive? It ſurely has not guided to all truth, if it did not, and that Mr. Lindſey's hypotheſis be true; and therefore even the Holy Ghoſt comes under this gentleman's charge of incompetency to be a witneſs to the great preſerver of all ſpirits.

Before I diſmiſs this ſubject I ſhall add one more remark, which, if it do not afford concluſive proof of what has been advanced already, muſt be allowed greatly to corroborate the force of it.

"Behold," ſays Stephen, "I ſee the heavens opened, and the Son of man ſtanding on the right hand of God; then they cried out with a loud voice, and ſtopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, &c." Acts vii. 56, 57. "Hereafter," ſays our Lord, "ſhall ye ſee the Son of man ſitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven: then the high prieſt rent his clothes, ſaying, he hath ſpoken blaſphemy," "then did they ſpit in his face, and buffeted him, &c." Matth. xxvi. 64, 65, 67. "Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the bleſſed? and Jeſus ſaid, I am. And ye ſhall ſee the Son of man ſitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high prieſt rent his clothes, and ſaith, What need we any farther witneſſes, ye have heard the blaſphemy? what think ye? and they all condemned him to be guilty of death, and ſome began to ſpit on him, &c." Matth. xiv. 61 to 65. When Jeſus ſaid, "before Abraham was, I am," "the Jews took up ſtones to caſt at him;" when he ſaid, "I and my Father are one, they took up ſtones again to ſtone him," ſaying, "becauſe that thou being a man makeſt thyſelf God." The Jews alſo ſought to kill him, "becauſe he ſaid that God was his Father, making himſelf equal

equal with God." Here the ground of the Jewiſh reſentment appears, they were Unitarians, and looked upon an equality or unity of Godhead between the Father and Son as the greateſt indignity to the God of their fathers. To the words for which our Saviour was condemned by the high prieſt and his council, we may therefore aſcribe the ſame meaning, and conclude that they were deſigned to convey the ſame idea of our Lord's equal and one Godhead with the Father. The very ſame thing which Jeſus here ſays they ſhall hereafter ſee, St. Stephen declares to the very ſame tribunal to be now before his eyes; and the very ſame conſequence attends his declaration; ſo that we may conſider Stephen as having in this reſpect alſo borne his teſtimony to the one Godhead of the Father and of the Son of man.

XXXII.

After Peter had healed Eneas at Lydda, ſaying, "Jeſus Chriſt maketh thee whole, ariſe," the friends of Tabitha, who was ſick, and had died at Joppa, in the neighbourhood of the town where he had wrought this miracle, ſolicited his immediate attendance; upon which he aroſe and went with them, and coming into the chamber where they had laid her body, and having put forth all thoſe who ſtood weeping by, "he kneeled down and prayed, and turning him to the body, ſaid, Tabitha, ariſe. And ſhe opened her eyes: and when ſhe ſaw Peter, ſhe ſat up," Acts ix. 40. "And it was known throughout all Joppa; and many believed in the Lord," verſe 42. The words which Peter ſpoke to Eneas were addreſſed to him in order to induce his faith, and that of thoſe who ſaw the work which he had done, in the Lord. But in the caſe of Tabitha, where he had put forth thoſe whoſe clamorous grief might interrupt the fervour of his devotion, and remained alone with the dead body, ſuch

ſuch language being abſolutely unneceſſary, it is very probable that Peter did not uſe it on that account; but as there is no doubt that the ſame Jeſus Chriſt, who had made Eneas whole, now called Tabitha back to life, it is ſurely to be inferred that the prayer of Peter was preferred to him; and this is the more probable, when we ſee that the conſequence of her revival on the call of Peter was, that "many believed on the Lord," for many who ſaw what had been done to Eneas "turned to the Lord."

XXXIII.

"When God had to the Gentiles alſo granted repentance unto life," "ſome of the diſciples which were come to Antioch, ſpake unto the Grecians preaching the Lord Jeſus. And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord:" upon which, when the church at Jeruſalem heard it, "they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch. Who, when he came, and had ſeen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpoſe of heart they would cleave unto the Lord," Acts xi. 18, 20, 21, 22, 23. Upon the hand of the Lord being with them, Barnabas is glad to have ſeen the grace of God; or, he was glad upon having ſeen the "grace of God, who hath to the Gentiles alſo granted repentance unto life:" "but we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we ſhall be ſaved even as they," Acts xv. 11. Here the grace of the Lord Jeſus, and of God, are one and the ſame, the ſame alſo is the one Godhead of the Father and of the Son.

XXXIV.

That our Saviour was not intended "to be a light to lighten the Gentiles," and conſequently, that the full manifeſtation of his Godhead was delayed till

after his aſcenſion, as I have already ſhewed, is evident from the following words of St. Paul to the Jews at Antioch, who were contradicting and blaſpheming, becauſe he gratified the requeſt of the Gentiles, and on the ſabbath day preached to them alſo "the word of God." "It was neceſſary," ſaid he and Barnabas, "that the word of God ſhould firſt have been ſpoken to you: but ſeeing ye put it from you, and judge yourſelves unworthy of everlaſting life, lo! we turn to the Gentiles. For ſo hath the Lord commanded us, ſaying, I have ſet thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou ſhouldeſt be for ſalvation unto the ends of the earth," Acts xiii. 45, 46, 47. Theſe words were ſpoken by the Lord to Iſaiah, when he aſked him, was it a light thing that he appointed him to be his ſervant, and "for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayeſt be my ſalvation unto the end of the earth?" Iſa. xlix. 6. Theſe words evidently ſpoken by God to Iſaiah, and as evidently alluded to by St. Paul, who declares them a prophecy of the appointment made by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt to his Apoſtles, whom he had commanded "to go forth and preach his name to all nations, and to be his witneſſes unto the uttermoſt parts of the earth," to teach repentance and remiſſion of ſins among all nations in his name, "and to bear his name to the Gentiles," are an uncontrovertible evidence that the Lord, who commanded the apoſtles, ſaying, "I have ſet, &c." is the ſame God who had before ſpoken by his holy prophet. It is farther remarkable, that our Saviour then firſt "opened their underſtanding that they might underſtand the ſcriptures, and ſee the neceſſity there was that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer and riſe from the dead the third day, when he was about to commiſſion them to go forth and preach him to the Gentiles, which was not till after his reſurrection, not indeed till the moment preceding his aſcenſion.

ſion. "He was not ſent but to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael," Matth. xv. 24. "for it was neceſſary that the word of God ſhould firſt have been ſpoken to them;" "but when they had put it from them," and offered up this great ſacrifice for the ſins of the whole world, hanging upon a croſs "the Lord of glory," we find that, after he was made perfect by ſuffering death, and, by his ſuffering, had atoned for and adopted all nations, he was to be preached to the Gentiles, ſo that the whole which he came to do according to the ſcriptures, by which it was ſeen that it behoved him to die and riſe again from the dead, could not have preceded his death, for ſo the profit had been only to Iſrael; to them were his life and leſſons, but to the whole world his ſalvation, which was to be promulgated after he had died for it; he therefore now ſent out the apoſtles to hold forth this great light to lighten the Gentiles alſo, according to the prophecy before, certifying to them, "that they ſhould be for ſalvation unto the ends of the earth." Paul and Barnabas continued ſome time at Antioch, preaching the "word of God," "and when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed. And the word of the Lord was publiſhed throughout all the region," Acts xiii. 48, 49. The Jews having ſtirred up the honourable women, and raiſed a perſecution againſt them, they proceeded to Iconium, where they "ſo ſpake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews, and alſo of the Greeks, believed," "long time therefore abode they, ſpeaking boldly in the Lord, which gave teſtimony unto the word of his Grace, and granted ſigns and wonders to be done by their hands," Acts xiv. 1, 3. What Paul and Barnabas preached is to be collected from its being ſaid, that both Jews and Greeks believed. The God of the Jew and of the Unitarian is

the ſame; it was not therefore the God of the Jews, that the Jews were now firſt induced to believe; the Jews preached not their Jehovah, they ſought not to make proſelytes, it was not therefore in the God of the Jews that the Greeks believed; but Paul was ſent "to bear the name of Chriſt to the Gentiles, and to all nations, beginning from Jeruſalem;" that the ſecond perſon of the Godhead was then the object of Paul's doctrine to thoſe who needed not a teacher of the one Godhead, but knew nothing before of the three Perſons in that Godhead, is evident hence; and therefore we may, with thoſe believing Jews, lay aſide the Unitarian ſyſtems of Mr. Lindſey, and believe, that Jeſus Chriſt, who, according to his promiſe that "he would be with them alway, even unto the end of the world," Matth. xxviii. 20. "continued working with them, and confirming the word with ſigns following," Mark xvi. 20. "and who now gave teſtimony unto the word of his grace, and granted ſigns and wonders to be done by their hands," Acts xiv. 3. is one with the Father, that "God who bore them witneſs, both with ſigns and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, according to his own will," Heb. ii. 4. "that God who wrought ſpecial miracles by the hands of Paul" before thoſe "who heard him preach the word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks," Acts xix. 11, 10.

XXXV.

When the ſame Lord, who, juſt before his aſcenſion, had "opened the underſtanding of his diſciples, that they might underſtand the ſcriptures," Luke xxiv. 45. had opened the heart of Lydia, a ſeller of purple, at Thyatira, that ſhe attended unto the things which were ſpoken of Paul, and conſtrained him to abide with her; a damſel, poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of divination, "followed Paul, and us, and cried, ſaying, theſe

theſe men are the ſervants of the moſt high God, which ſhew unto us the way of ſalvation," Acts xvi. 14, 15, 16, 17. Jeſus Chriſt, when veiled in the fleſh, "ſuffered not the devils to ſpeak, becauſe they knew him," Mark i. 34; even the teſtimony of this ſpirit of divination then is to be admitted, and it has called Paul, who declares himſelf to the Romans i. 1. to be "a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt," "a ſervant of the moſt high God." The ſpace contracts itſelf exceedingly between Son of man and God moſt high. Paul has himſelf addreſſed not the Romans only, but the Philippians, under the title of the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt," Philip. i. 1. and to Titus he commences his epiſtle by the name of "Paul, a ſervant of God," Titus i. 1. Theſe terms are therefore ſynonimous.

XXXVI.

The doctrine of Paul and Silas to the Keeper of the priſon at Philippi, and the conſequence of it, are remarkable. The keeper ſaid to Paul and Silas, his priſoners, "Sirs, what muſt I do to be ſaved? and they ſaid, believe on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be ſaved, and thy houſe. And they ſpake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his houſe. And he took them the ſame hour of the night, and waſhed their ſtripes; and was baptized, he, and all his, ſtraightway. And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his houſe," Acts xvi. 30 to 34. Here is a very rapid tranſaction. Paul and Silas being at prayer, and ſinging hymns at midnight, the foundations of the priſon are ſhaken, the doors fly open, and the bands of the priſoners are looſed; the keeper, terrified at the probability of their eſcape, falls into deſpair; and, about to take away his own life, is reſtrained by Paul, who, to his aſtoniſhment, ſhewed himſelf and the reſt undiſmayed, without chains, and yet not making uſe

of

or ſo favourable an opportunity. Convinced that ſome power controlled the ordinary courſe of nature, and had interfered in behalf of his priſoners, the man immediately applies to them to know what he ſhould do to be ſaved: and here the apoſtles preach to a heathen, that his ſalvation is to be the conſequence of his belief in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and accordingly we find him, even at the ſame hour of the night, rejoice, and indeed believe in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, one with the Father, God.

XXXVII.

In the Acts, St. Luke ſays, that "becauſe Paul preached Jeſus to the Athenians, they ſaid he ſeemed to be a ſetter forth of ſtrange gods," Acts xvii. 18. On this they queſtioned him, and his anſwer was, that having ſeen among them an altar inſcribed TO THE UNKNOWN GOD, "whom therefore ye ignorantly worſhip, him declare I unto you," ver. 23. Here, upon a call to explain himſelf, and anſwer the charge of ſetting forth ſtrange gods, in having preached Jeſus, he avows, that he whom he had preached was that God whom they knew not, but worſhipped ignorantly: but he had preached Jeſus; therefore Jeſus Chriſt was that God hitherto unknown to them, and one with the Father. The attributes with which the apoſtle proceeds to characterize the God, to whoſe worſhip he is perſuading the Athenians, are as follow, and, in appoſition to them, I will put thoſe attributes which are by the ſame preacher aſcribed to Jeſus Chriſt; and if upon compariſon it be found that he has arrayed him with the ſame power and glory as he propoſes to the Athenians to invite their adoration to God, we may, we muſt ſay, that he is that God, and that honour and religious worſhip are his due who is poſſeſſed of the ſame glory to excite them.

Of

Of God whom he preached at Athens, even Jeſus, he ſays,

" God that made the world, and all things therein, ſeeing that he is the Lord of heaven and earth," ver. 24; " for in him we live, and move, and have our being," ver. 28.

Of Jeſus Chriſt, expreſsly ſo named, he ſays,

" By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt," Coloſſ. i. 16, 17.

If then the excluſive prerogatives of God be in Jeſus Chriſt, and that we ſee him clothed in that glory of which God has ſpoken, ſaying, " I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another," Iſaiah xlii. 8. we muſt ſurely ſay of him who wears it, that he is one with the Father God. That which is but one, even the glory, and which the declaration of God had made incommunicable, muſt be a diſtinguiſhing mark of him who has declared that he will not impart it. Jeſus Chriſt has this glory: the declaration therefore came from that Godhead which is his equally as the Father's.

XXXVIII.

" And Criſpus, the chief ruler of the ſynagogue, believed on the Lord with all his houſe: and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized. Then ſpake the Lord to Paul in the night by a viſion, be not afraid, but ſpeak, and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man ſhall ſet on thee,

thee, to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them," Acts xviii. 8, 9, 10, 11. That they who were baptized believed upon Jesus Christ, on hearing him preached, is evident from the necessity of that belief to baptism: that it was Jesus Christ whom Paul preached, is therefore evident also, for "how should they believe without a preacher." But Paul is in a vision called upon by the Lord to persevere without apprehension of danger, and accordingly we find him continue to teach the word of God among them, the same doctrine that he had before held forth that they might believe and be baptized. Lest it should be doubted who the Lord was who spake to him, I will remind my reader of a similar vision, wherein "in the night." "the Lord stood by him, and said, be of good chear, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome," Acts xxiii. 11. As we know well whose name Paul was chosen to bear before the Gentiles, and that he was the Lord who spake to him now, we have no reason to doubt that it was the same Lord Jesus Christ who cheared him in the instance before us, and allayed the apprehensions which a man, who had undergone such persecutions for the sake of Christ, might reasonably entertain, if he persevered in the maintenance of his testimony.

XXXIX.

That the prophecies were in themselves insufficient to make a perfect revelation of Christ, nay, that the baptism of John was not sufficient to make him known, is evident from the case of Apollos, "a man mighty in the scriptures, fervent in spirit, who spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, at Ephesus;" but that these were a strong assistant testimony to the manifestation of his Godhead, afterwards by the spirit

of

of truth, is evident alſo from the doctrines of the ſame man, who, "knowing only the baptiſm of John, was inſtructed by Aquila and Priſcilla, who expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly," upon which "he helped them much which had believed through grace; for he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, ſhewing by the ſcriptures, that Jeſus was Chriſt," Acts xviii. 24 to 28.

XL.

Paul having continued, by the ſpace of two years, daily diſputing in the ſchool of one Tyrannus, "all they which dwelt in Aſia, heard the word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks," Acts xix. 10. And having manifeſted that God bore witneſs to that which he teſtified by ſpecial miracles wrought by his hands, "fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jeſus was magnified. Many alſo of them which uſed curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them before all men: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thouſand pieces of ſilver. So mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed," Acts xix. 17, 18, 19, 20. But it was the word of the Lord Jeſus which they had heard; therefore it was his word that grew and prevailed; his name therefore is worthily magnified, being one with the Father, God.

XLI.

When Agabus foretold to Paul, that he ſhould be bound at Jeruſalem, and delivered into the hands of the Gentiles, the diſciples "beſought him not to go up to Jeruſalem. Then Paul anſwered, what mean ye to weep, and to break mine heart? for I am ready, not to be bound only, but alſo to die at Jeruſalem for the name of the Lord Jeſus. And when he would not be perſuaded, we ceaſed, ſaying, the will of the Lord be done," Acts xxi. 11, 12, 13, 14. The context here ſhews, that the Lord, to whoſe will the apoſtles re-

ſigned themſelves, was the Lord Jeſus, for whoſe name Paul was ready to reſign himſelf, not to bonds only, but to death. This example therefore authoriſes us to addreſs to the Lord Jeſus that expreſſion of our ſubmiſſiveneſs to his pleaſure in the Lord's prayer, "thy will be done in earth," Matth. vi. 10.

XLII.

"Ariſe, and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord," Acts xxii. 16. Belief in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt is throughout the ſcriptures made neceſſary to baptiſm; and the teſtimony of Saul's belief, which is required by Ananias here, in order to his being baptized, is nothing leſs than invocation itſelf.

XLIII.

"And it came to paſs, that when I was come again to Jeruſalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance: and ſaw him ſaying unto me," Acts xxii. 17, 18. Whom did Paul ſee? the pronoun *him* has no antecedent ſubſtantive to which it ſhould be referred, though it be made the ſubject of a long ſubſequent detail; the antecedent then muſt be ſought for from the meaning of the ſentence altogether; but it is therein declared that Paul prayed. The object of his adoration then is the ſubject of the propoſition, and this ſubject is then found to be the antecedent to this pronoun. But of this object of Paul's religious worſhip, it is ſaid, that he "ſaw *him* ſaying unto him, Make haſte, and get thee quickly out of Jeruſalem: for they will not receive thy teſtimony concerning me. And I ſaid, Lord, they know that I impriſoned, and beat in every ſynagogue them that believed on thee. And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was ſhed, I alſo was ſtanding by, and conſenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that ſlew him," Acts xxii. 18, 19, 20. That it was of Jeſus Chriſt Paul was to bear teſtimony,

ny, is a well-eſtabliſhed fact; and that it was of Jeſus Chriſt that the Jews would not receive Paul's teſtimony, is clear from this, that they were very ready to receive an Unitarian doctrine. That Stephen, at whoſe blood-ſhedding Paul ſtood by, conſenting to his death, was the martyr of Chriſt, is alſo certain; for the word martyr ſignifies no more than witneſs, and it was for the teſtimony of Chriſt that he died. That Jeſus Chriſt, upon the whole, was the object of Paul's religious worſhip in the temple, is evident; and therefore Mr. Lindſey himſelf muſt conclude him, one with the Father, God.

XLIV.

Paul charged before Felix with "having gone about to profane the temple," and being "a ringleader of the ſect of the Nazarenes," Acts xxiv. 5. declares himſelf not guilty of any profanation of the temple; but to the other part of the accuſation he anſwers, "But this I confeſs unto thee, that, after the way which they call hereſy, ſo worſhip I the God of my Fathers, believing all things that are written in the law and the prophets," Acts xxiv. 14. The ſcriptures, that is, the law and the prophets, "are they which teſtified of Chriſt," John v. 39. according to that teſtimony, which Paul's "underſtanding was opened that he might underſtand," this bold apoſtle of our Lord declares himſelf a worſhipper of the God of his Fathers; but this he acknowledges he is, according to the charge before Felix, that he was a ringleader of the ſect of the Nazarenes. Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth is here therefore pronounced by Paul to be the God of his Fathers, even one in Godhead with Jehovah, the Father.———

XLV.

St. Paul commences his epiſtle to the Romans thus, "Paul, a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, called to be an apoſtle, and ſeparated unto the goſpel of God," Rom. i. 1.

and then making a declaration of his great good-will towards them, he says, "For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers," Romans i. 9. So that here, in the same breath, this great apostle of our Lord and Saviour declares himself the servant of Jesus Christ, the preacher of the gospel of God, and the servant of God, the preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ. One only is the Master whom Paul served, and he, whose gospel Paul preached, but one, even Jesus Christ one with the Father, God.

XLVI.

"Thinkest thou that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" Rom. ii. 3; but "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," John v. 22. who "shall reward every man according to his works," Matth. xvi. 27. Who then is that God whose judgment is inevitable? certainly Jesus Christ one with the Father, that "God, who will render to every man according to his deeds," Rom. ii. 6.

XLVII.

"Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance," Rom. ii. 4. to "repentance unto life," Acts xi. 18. "Howbeit," says the same apostle, "for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting," 1 Tim. i. 16. We must then "account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written," 2 Pet. iii. 15. Who then is this Lord, who, "is long-suffering to us-ward?" "not willing that any

any ſhould periſh, but that all ſhould come to repentance," 2 Pet. iii. 9. Certainly he is the ſame Lord Jeſus Chriſt who mercifully ſhewed all long-ſuffering to Paul, for a pattern to them who ſhould hereafter believe on him to everlaſting life; one, with the Father, God, the riches of whoſe goodneſs, and forbearance, and long-ſuffering, leadeth to repentance unto life.

XLVIII.

The argument carried on through the latter part of the third, and the whole of the fourth chapter of St. Paul's epiſtle to the Romans, affords a ſtrong proof of the Godhead of Chriſt. Abraham was faithful in God, his faith was imputed to him for righteouſneſs, and the promiſe was therefore made to him; he believed in God, and was juſtified by his belief; but God is declared to be the "juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus," Rom. iii. 26. The faith of Abraham, and the fruits of it are ſet forth as a pattern and perſuaſive to us to have faith in Jeſus; but the faith of Abraham, whereby he was juſtified, was in God. Were Jeſus Chriſt therefore other than God, he could not have been held out to us by this eloquent preacher of his goſpel, as an object of faith after the example of Abraham. The ſame mode of argument is carried through the 11th chapter of Hebrews, and in the 12th we are told that Jeſus Chriſt is the object of faith.

XLIX.

"Ye are not in the fleſh, but in the ſpirit, if ſo be that the ſpirit of God dwelleth in you. Now, if any man have not the ſpirit of Chriſt, he is none of his," Rom. viii. 9. Here the context, and the courſe of St. Paul's argument, put it out of controverſy, that the ſpirit of God and the ſpirit of Chriſt are ſynonimous terms; but of him, whoſe this ſpirit is, it is ſaid, that "he raiſed up Jeſus from the dead," Rom. viii. 11.

which

which affords an apoſtolical expreſſion of that which I have already laid down, that the one Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, was indeed the power which raiſed up the man Jeſus from the dead; for though I aſſert that Chriſt is God, I never yet denied that he was alſo a Man, and that his manhood was inferior to that Godhead which was in the fleſh, and upon which the ſtate of man is neceſſarily dependent.

L.

"Whoſe are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen," Rom. ix. 5. As it is not a very common caſe for men to come of their fathers as concerning any thing elſe than the fleſh, St. Paul has uſed an expreſſion concerning Chriſt, which implies, that he had come of ſome other origin than of the Jews, and in ſome other manner than as concerning the fleſh, and therefore has rendered an explanation neceſſary, which he accordingly proceeds to make; and in order to ſhew what that nature of Chriſt was, from which he had diſtinguiſhed his fleſh, he directly aſſerts in ſo many expreſs words, that "he is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen."

LI.

"For the ſame Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him. For whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord, ſhall be ſaved. How then ſhall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how ſhall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how ſhall they hear without a preacher?" Rom. x. 12, 13. St. Paul is here preaching Jeſus, of the confeſſion of whom cometh ſalvation, and in whom, he ſays, whoſoever believeth ſhall not be aſhamed: and, as a reaſon for what he had ſaid, declares him rich to all that call upon him, and that ſalvation is the fruit of invoking him. Here Mr. Lindſey muſt confeſs him

one

one with the Father, God. He is here preaching to the Jew as well as the Greek; and to the Jew a preacher was ſurely not wanting to induce his belief in Jehovah, the God of the Unitarians.

LII.

" He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. For none of us liveth to himſelf, and no man dieth to himſelf. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Chriſt both died, and roſe, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living," Rom. xiv. 6, 7, 8, 9. St. Paul here makes our eating " to the Lord" depend upon our giving God thanks, which are therefore a dedication of the act; but this dedication of the act is to God, whereas the act itſelf is, in conſequence of it, " to the Lord:" the Lord therefore to whom we find it to be done muſt be the ſame God, to whom by thankſgiving it had been addreſſed. But who that Lord is to whom we eat or eat not, to whom we live or die, and whoſe we are, the following verſes render very certain; and he it is who died, and roſe, and revived, even Jeſus Chriſt, over all, one with the Father, God, bleſſed for ever, the proper object of our gratitude and thankſgiving, " to whoſe glory, whether we eat, or drink, or whatſoever we do, we ſhould do all," 1 Cor. x. 31: " for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullneſs thereof," 1 Cor. x. 28.

LIII.

" For we ſhall all ſtand before the judgment-ſeat of Chriſt. For it is written, As I live, ſaith the Lord, every knee ſhall bow to me, and every tongue ſhall confeſs to God. So then every one of us ſhall give account of himſelf to God," Rom. xiv. 10, 11, 12. Here, in bowing

bowing the knee to Jesus Christ, we fulfil the prophecy that is expressly spoken to Isaiah, by God, of himself, "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear," Isaiah xlv. 23. If this then be fulfilled by the bowing the knee to Christ, Christ is that God who spoke this prophecy. I must then refer to the whole chapter, every declaration in which is made of him who has so spoken, even Jesus Christ: "there is no God else beside me, a just God, and a Saviour, there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else," Isaiah xlv. 21, 22. Besides this circumstance, every man is here confessing to God before the judgment-seat of Christ, therefore that God, (one with the Father) before whom they are confessing, "for we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men," 2 Cor. v. 10; and surely when arrayed in all the terrors with which he will come to judgment, "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," Heb. x. 31.

LIV.

"I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself," Rom. xiv. 14. We do not find any particular revelation made to Paul that there is nothing unclean: he must then have had it from Peter, to whom it was revealed, and who says, "God hath shewed me, that I should not call any man common or unclean;" and this the Lord had shewed him by a vision in which Peter is called upon to eat things heretofore common and unclean, but now cleansed by God. If Paul therefore was persuaded by Jesus Christ, through

through the relation made by Peter, we find him look upon our Lord to be the God which had ſhewed the viſion to him; or, if Paul had a like viſion, it is very probable that it was preſented to him and to Peter by the ſame agent: but as Paul is not ſaid to have had ſuch a revelation himſelf, the former ſuppoſition is moſt to be relied on. But if it be inſiſted on that Paul was perſuaded by the Spirit, with which he was full, it muſt follow, that the Holy Ghoſt, proceeding from the Father, proceeds equally from the Son, by whom Paul declares himſelf to be perſuaded.

LV.

" That I ſhould be the miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt to the Gentiles, miniſtering the goſpel of God," Rom. xv. 16. He goes on to ſay, that, according to this appointment, " from Jeruſalem and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the goſpel of Chriſt," Rom. xv. 19; but he declines boaſting of the mighty ſigns and wonders which he did in confirmation of this goſpel by the power of the ſpirit of God. The grace which was given to him, that he ſhould be a miniſter of Chriſt, is that wherein he ſays he may glory, and not in the miracles he had wrought, which, however, he declares to be the work of Chriſt by the hands of thoſe who do them. The goſpel of God is here the goſpel of Chriſt, that which is God's is not another's: Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, God.

LVI.

" The churches of Chriſt ſalute you," Rom. xvi. 16. " Paul called to be an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, through the will of God, and Soſthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth," 1 Cor. i. 1, 2. It is remarkable that St. Paul wrote from Corinth to Rome, and in his epiſtle thence calls the churches there the churches of Chriſt; and that when he is at another time writing to the very ſame churches which he had ſo

denominated, he addreſſes himſelf "to the church of God which is at Corinth," and deſcribes the members of this church to be "ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus, called to be ſaints, and calling upon the name of the Lord Jeſus, both theirs and ours." There is but one church of God, and that is of Chriſt who is called upon in it: Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, God. "Grace be unto you," ſays St. Paul, immediately after addreſſing the church which called upon the Lord Jeſus, whom he profeſſes to be his Lord and theirs, "and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt;" and then he proceeds, "I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jeſus Chriſt," 1 Cor. i. 3, 4. This is a very extraordinary gift for our Saviour to make if it was not his to give; but he has given it. The grace of God is therefore the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, with the Father, one God.

LVII.

"So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: who ſhall alſo confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameleſs in the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt," 1 Cor. i. 7, 8. "He that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkneſs, and will make manifeſt the counſels of the hearts: and then ſhall every man have praiſe of God," 1 Cor. iv. 4, 5. That God, for whoſe praiſe Paul is contented to wait, rather than ſeek the praiſe of men, is certainly the Lord who will come to judge, and to make manifeſt the counſels of the hearts. But that the Lord who "judgeth Paul" is the Lord Jeſus, whoſe coming he deſires the Corinthians to wait for, that in his day they may be found blameleſs, is alſo certain: the concluſion is, that the Lord Jeſus is the Lord, and that "the Lord he

he is God;" and if this needed farther proof, it will appear from the following texts to be the Lord Jesus Christ whose praise he desireth: "we are come as far as to you also, in preaching the gospel of Christ: having hope, when your faith is encreased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, to preach the gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand. But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth," 2 Cor. x. 14 to 18.

LVIII.

"For it hath been declared unto me, that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" 1 Cor. i. 11, 12, 13. From Christ's not being divided, he dissuades them from divisions, ver. 10. "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered: but God gave the encrease," 1 Cor. iii. 5, 6. So that God who gave to every man the encrease, that is, assisted them in receiving the gospel, which was planted and watered by Paul and Apollos, is the Lord, according to whose gift they believed. Of Jesus Christ it is said, that "he shall confirm them unto the end," 1 Cor. i. 8. That which was given to every man, confirmation in faith, is then the gift of Jesus Christ the Lord; but God gave the encrease: therefore Jesus Christ, the Lord who gave it, is one with the Father, God.

LIX.

" I thank God, that I baptized none of you, but Criſpus and Gaius: leſt any ſhould ſay, that I had baptized in my own name," 1 Cor. i. 14, 15. As Jeſus Chriſt had given command to his diſciples to baptize " in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt," one God; and as they, in obedience to this command, went forth into all nations, baptizing in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, one with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, God, (for I dare not ſuppoſe them diſobedient to the voice of their aſcending Lord) Paul, having reprehended the Corinthians for looking upon him, Apollos, and Cephas, as equally objects of their adherence as Chriſt, who alone was crucified for them, proceeds to return thanks to God that he had not led ſuch unſtable ſouls into farther errour, and by the exerciſe of that duty which was to be performed in the name of God, brought them to transfer that divinity to himſelf which belonged to Chriſt only: for if their preaching Chriſt crucified could bring his hearers to conceive the preachers as Chriſt, he eaſily ſaw that baptiſm in his name would have induced them to look upon them as baptizing in their own name, and aſſuming to themſelves that Godhead, to the belief in which baptiſm was adminiſtered in the name of Chriſt; an errour of ſo great magnitude, that the apoſtle is very happy in not having afforded occaſion for it to men, whom he ſaw ſo ready to miſinterpret the miniſtry and apoſtleſhip of the goſpel, which he had preached among them. Mr. Lindſey draws a very extraordinary concluſion from the paſſage before us, and ſays, it affords a proof that " baptizing in the name of any one does not of itſelf imply any divinity in the perſon in whoſe name baptiſm is made." I requeſt that this chapter may be turned to, and refer it to the meaneſt reader, who ſhall honour me with a peruſal, whether Mr. Lindſey has not fallen into the very

very errour which St. Paul is here cenſuring in the Corinthians; for at the leaſt it muſt be admitted that Paul's thankſgiving is made, either that they did not account him as Chriſt, or Chriſt as him.

LX.

As I have already proved that it was Jeſus Chriſt who ſent forth the apoſtles to preach him, and who had choſen thoſe veſſels which ſhould bear his name before the Gentiles, I ſhall not now repeat the arguments already made uſe of, but deſire my reader may compare the paſſages brought together to that purpoſe, with the following declaration of St. Paul, "that not many wiſe men after the fleſh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath choſen the fooliſh things of the world, to confound the wiſe; and God hath choſen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty; that no fleſh ſhould glory in his preſence," 1 Cor. i. 26, 27, 28, 29. This he ſpeaks of the preachers of the goſpel who had been ſent by Jeſus Chriſt; for he ſays, "it pleaſed God by the fooliſhneſs of preaching to ſave them that believe," 1 Cor. i. 21. Jeſus Chriſt therefore, who choſe them, and "whoſe ſtrength is perfected in weakneſs," is one with the Father, God; who hath choſen the weak things to confound the mighty. "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord," 1 Cor. i. 31, and 2 Cor. x. 17; in which latter place it is evidently ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt. It is reaſonably to be concluded then that he is the Lord, in whom Paul deſires us to glory; "as it is written," by Jeremiah, to whom God ſpeaks, "let him that glorieth, glory in this; that he underſtandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord, which exerciſe loving-kindneſs, judgement and righteouſneſs in the earth: for in theſe things I delight, ſaith the Lord," Jer. ix. 24.

"Had

LXI.

" Had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory," 1 Cor. ii. 8. " Ye killed the Prince of Life," or, as it ſtands in the margin of the Bible, " the Author of Life." And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did alſo your rulers," Acts iii. 15, 17. " My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt *the Lord* of glory, with reſpect of perſons," James ii. 1. In this laſt text the tranſlation has ſupplied the words " *the Lord*," but the following words " of glory," which expreſs the whole meaning in the Greek, require them, or others to the ſame purpoſe, to expreſs it in Engliſh; and St. Paul's having uſed the whole phraſe is a ſufficient warrant to the tranſlators for preferring that which they have uſed. And the Lord of glory is a title not very applicable to a creature; for God has ſaid, " I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another." " Who is this King of glory? the Lord of Hoſts, he is the King of glory," Pſa. xxiv. 10. Who is this Prince and Author of life? " The Lord God who formed man of the duſt of the ground, and breathed into his noſtrils the breath of life," Gen. ii. 7.

LXII.

" We ſpeak the wiſdom of God in a myſtery." " The things of God knoweth no man, but the ſpirit of God." " But God has revealed them unto us by his ſpirit:" " we have received, not the ſpirit of the world, but the ſpirit which is of God:" " but the natural man receiveth not the things of the ſpirit of God;" " for who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may inſtruct him? but we have the mind of Chriſt," 1 Cor. ii. 7, to the end, This needs no comment.

LXIII.

That Chriſt himſelf ſpoke by the apoſtles, is evident from what follows. Paul ſays to the Corinthians, " Now,

" Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgement as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful," 1 Cor. vii. 25. Here the preacher makes a diſtinction between that effect which the immediate dictate of the ſpirit had on him, with the authority of ſpeech derived from thence, and the improvement of his natural judgement by the means of habitual faith, through which indeed he became a wiſer and a better man, but not more authorized to preſcribe. St. Paul often ſpeaks of his having obtained mercy of Jeſus Chriſt, whence it is evident that Chriſt is the Lord meant here. " To the Lord our God belong mercies, and forgiveneſſes." Dan. ix. 9. Let him then who extends them be acknowledged to be the God of our ſalvation.

LXIV.

St. Paul ſays to the Corinthians, " We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one," 1 Cor. viii. 4. This unity of the God, of whom, and by whom he declares all things to be, is oppoſed to the multitude of idols to which the Corinthians offered ſacrifice. Theſe he is about to put down, and in their place to eſtabliſh the worſhip of the true God; and now, if ever accuracy of expreſſion be neceſſary, it was incumbent upon St. Paul to diſtinguiſh between the Father and the Son, in terms never to be confounded, to aſcribe ſuch attributes to each as muſt perfectly diſtinguiſh him from the other; nay, perhaps he ſhould have gone farther, and have abſolutely omitted the name of him, who was not to be conſidered as a proper object of worſhip, leſt his idolatrous hearers, to whom a multitude of gods would not have been exceptionable, ſhould interpret his words into an implication, that he, who was deſcribed to them with attributes the very ſame as thoſe beſtowed upon God, was pointed out as an object of adoration, inſtead

of

of the idols which they heard him object to, and inſtead of which he was about to ſubſtitute a God for them. Has this been the conduct of the apoſtle? has he diligently withheld the name of Jeſus Chriſt, while he recommends a new worſhip? If not, I think it reaſonably to be concluded, that he did recommend the worſhip of Jeſus Chriſt to them; to whom he ſays, "though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. viii. 6. To me this text appears concluſive for the one Godhead of the Father and of the Son. In the ſame manner Paul and Barnabas, after they had at Lyſtra "preached the goſpel," and, by a miracle of healing, confirmed the teſtimony which they bore to the truth of their doctrines, and had received divine honours from the idolaters of the country, diſſuade them from doing ſacrifice unto them, but "preached unto them, that they ſhould turn from theſe vanities unto the living God, which made heaven and earth, and the ſea, and all things that are therein," Acts xiv. 7, 15. I ſhall here take occaſion to obſerve, upon a very particular mode of argument made uſe of by Mr. Lindſey, in order to get rid of the concluſion, which naturally follows from the application of the ſame attributes to the name of the Father, and of the Son, ſo frequently made by the diſciples of our Lord. "The apoſtles," ſays this gentleman, Apology, p. 132, "were not ſo exact in the uſe of the words, Lord, Saviour, *and the like*, which they indifferently give both to God and to Chriſt, never ſuppoſing that any would miſtake their Lord and Maſter ſo lately born, and living amongſt men, to be the ſupreme God and object of worſhip." If the apoſtles, who, it is allowed, foreſaw that men would

would in future time depart from the truth, and, as Mr. Lindſey ſays, adopt a trinity from Plato, never conceived the poſſibility of ſuch a miſtake; they were, of all men, not only the moſt careleſs and inattentive, but the moſt heinouſly ſinful; for they ſinned againſt the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe inſpiration had given them a view into futurity, and that for the purpoſe of making them inſtrumental to the propagation and ſupport of truth only; but they have moſt wickedly neglected this firſt cauſe of their appointment; and miſrepreſentation, inſtead of being the fault of our perverſe wills, muſt hereafter be aſcribed to the inſufficiency of revelation, to the incompetency of thoſe whom God's choice had pronounced competent, or to their wilful omiſſion of that duty, to which God had been pleaſed to call them, and aſſiſt them with a "guide to all truth", for our inſtruction. I refer it to reaſon, whether common attributes do not imply, nay more, do not demonſtrate a common nature, and if to be our Lord, and our Saviour, *and the like*, be equally the attributes of God, and of the Son, whether the Son be not therefore God?

But theſe ſame apoſtles, according to Mr. Lindſey, not endowed with a prophetick view, but not even ſuppoſing a miſtake poſſible, muſt have been very extraordinary reaſoners, though they even derived their confidence, that, from the circumſtances of his having been born, and ſo lately living amongſt men, we ſhould not conclude the Godhead of Chriſt from their application of the divine attributes to his name. Will any man pretend that the birth and life of our Saviour were ſuch as ſhould mark his nature to be no more than that of the reſt of mankind? his death, his reſurrection from the dead, and his aſcenſion into heaven, followed immediately by the gift of the Holy

Ghoſt, according to his promiſe, might alſo lead the apoſtles to conſider, and preach him as ſomething more than an ordinary man; nay, that very birth which Mr. Lindſey thinks a proof that he was a meer man, the apoſtles, who have related it to us, knew to have been of a Virgin found with child of the Holy Ghoſt, and overſhadowed by the power of the Higheſt, and that the Holy Thing, which was born of that Virgin, was declared to be the Son of God. They alſo knew that life, which he paſt amongſt men, to have been ſpent in daily miracles, to have been ſo interrupted, and ſo reſumed, that it is aſtoniſhing to hear the birth and life of our Saviour made uſe of as a reaſon why we ſhould doubt the veracity of the apoſtles, when they declare him to be God, and why they ſhould not have conceived it neceſſary to mark ſuch a diſtinction as ſhould preclude the poſſibility of ſo momentous an errour, if an errour it be to aſcribe divinity to him, inſtead of uſing an inaccurate expreſſion, whereby we ſhould be led into an opinion that he is God. From that very birth and life, teſtifying whence, and with what endowments he came, I am led to interpret even ambiguous expreſſions as atteſtations of his Godhead, much more to yield my aſſent to ſuch as are perfectly explicit, and declare it without any ambiguity at all; of the latter ſort there are multitudes, from which the former derive their explanation; for if it be in one inſtance declared expreſsly, that "Chriſt is over all, God bleſſed for ever," it will be no difficulty to redeem the names of the diſciples of our Lord from the cruel charge of having lied to the Holy Ghoſt, or neglectingly rejected the conduct of this "guide to all truth;" and when they have uſed the words, Lord, and Saviour, *and the like*, and indifferently given them both to God, and to Chriſt, to declare that they have intentionally done it, in order to inculcate the doctrine of

our

our bleſſed Redeemer's divinity, inſtead of imputing to theſe inſpired men a criminal inaccuracy, the conſequence of which could not eſcape the foreſight of the meaneſt human underſtanding. "Ye know that ye were Gentiles carried away unto theſe dumb idols, even as ye were led. Wherefore I give you to underſtand, that no man ſpeaking by the ſpirit of God, calleth Jeſus accurſed, and that no man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt," 1 Cor. xii. 2, 3. "God is not the author of confuſion," 1 Cor. xiv. 33. I ſhall therefore rely upon the identity of expreſſion uſed in ſpeaking of God and of Chriſt, as evidence of the identity of the Godhead of the Father and of the Son; and as the paſſages occur, in which ſuch language is uſed, I ſhall quote them as teſtimonies of it.

LXV.

Speaking of the ſacrifices of the Gentiles, which he ſays were offered not to God but to devils, St. Paul ſays, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils," 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. Here is manifeſtly a declaration made, that the taking the cup of bleſſing, and the bread which we break, as the communion of the blood and body of Chriſt, is an act of worſhip to him, adequate to that of the Gentiles' ſacrifices to their idols. He does not indeed call it a ſacrifice, nor intimate that it is one, but ſays, that it is an aſcribing of honour to him, inconſiſtent with honour being paid to devils. In the ſame manner as our Saviour himſelf has ſaid, "Ye cannot ſerve God and mammon," St. Paul ſhews, that they cannot, conſiſtently with the worſhip of the true God, aſcribe honour to idols. "What concord hath Chriſt with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth, with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God

with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God, &c." 2 Cor. vi. 15, 16.

LXVI.

"We preach not ourſelves, but Chriſt Jeſus the Lord," 2 Cor. iv. 5. Theſe words I produce only to ſhew the object of the apoſtle's preaching, a circumſtance to which I am frequently obliged to refer. Paul has alſo defined the goſpel to be "the teſtimony of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt," 2 Tim. i. 8. The preaching of the goſpel is therefore the bearing teſtimony to him, which I wiſh to have remembered and carried on in the mind of my reader.

LXVII.

Were I to quote every paſſage in the ſecond epiſtle of St. Paul to the Corinthians that affords a proof of our Saviour's Godhead, I ſhould be under a neceſſity of tranſcribing the whole epiſtle, to which I therefore chooſe to refer my reader. One paſſage however I muſt ſelect, and ſhew its weight in the argument, becauſe Mr. Lindſey has taken ſome pains to extricate himſelf from the neceſſity of bending under it. It is indeed ſurprizing, that a man who has ſhewed ſo evidently his attachment to what he believes the truth, ſhould not be more circumſpect in the purſuit of her, but allow himſelf to be deceived by every painted fallacy that ſhall appear ever ſo little like the original. I am at a loſs to conceive how the following daubed maſk ſhould be taken for the native and unadorned ſimplicity of truth, by one who profeſſes himſelf enamoured of that ſimplicity. But upon the 12th chap. and 8, 9 ver. of 2 Cor. a Mr. Beauſobre has afforded the following comment, to which Mr. Lindſey accedes with the moſt ſupine facility. "For this thing I beſought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me," 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9. "Paul appears here to have directed his prayer to God, the Father, and to have had in his thoughts

thoughts and to have imitated our Lord's prayer in the garden, the night before his ſuffering, when he prayed to God, that, if it pleaſed him, the cup of affliction might paſs away from him without his drinking it." *Beauſobre* on the place. Apology, p. 132. Let us take the whole paſſage together, and examine it with the context, and then ſee whether the apoſtle had any ſuch ſtuff in his thoughts as the dreams of Mr. Beauſobre are made of. St. Paul having ſaid, "of myſelf I will not glory, but in mine infirmities," proceeds to give an account of thoſe infirmities, and to aſſign the reaſon why they are an object of glory to him, ſaying, "leſt I ſhould be exalted above meaſure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the fleſh, the meſſenger of Satan to buffet me, leſt I ſhould be exalted above meaſure. For this thing I beſought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he ſaid unto me, my grace is ſufficient for thee: for my ſtrength is made perfect in weakneſs. Moſt gladly therefore will I rather glory in mine infirmities, that the power of Chriſt may reſt upon me. Therefore I take pleaſure in infirmities, in reproaches, in neceſſities, in perſecutions, in diſtreſſes for Chriſt's ſake: for when I am weak, then am I ſtrong," 2 Cor. xii. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10. Wherefore does St. Paul glory? wherefore take pleaſure in his infirmities? that the power of Chriſt may reſt upon him; for, by ſuffering ſuch infirmities as contribute to perfect the ſtrength of the Lord, (to whom he prayed) in weakneſs, he is then ſtrong when he is weak: but he glories in his infirmities for Chriſt's ſake; it is the ſtrength of Chriſt then that is perfected in his weakneſs: but it is the Lord who ſaid, my ſtrength is made perfect in weakneſs; the Lord therefore who ſo ſpoke, is Chriſt: but of the Lord who ſo ſpoke, Paul thrice beſought the departure of "this thing." The Lord then being

Chriſt,

Chriſt, and Paul having thrice preferred his ſupplications to him, it neceſſarily follows, that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt is a proper object of prayer and religious worſhip, and therefore that he is one with the Father, God. Such is the concluſion from the context; whereas a deluſive aſſertion is inferred by a Mr. Beauſobre, from a partial quotation of but one ſmall part of the paſſage, in itſelf proving nothing, but made the ſubject of the weakeſt comment that ever obtained the acquieſcence of a man of virtue; a man, whoſe errours afflict me, as I honour his worth. I cannot ſee him turn aſide from the ſtudy of the word of God itſelf, to the ſtudy of the manner in which partial viſionaries have interpreted it, without ſenſible regret. I do not deſire that even my comment ſhould ſupplant a ſingle inference drawn by a ſenſible and candid man, from a peruſal of the ſcriptures themſelves; it cannot therefore be expected that I ſhall indulge Mr. Lindſey in laying aſide the uſe of his own better underſtanding, that he may adopt the doctrines of a multitude of deſigning or ſilly men and women upon whom he places ſuch implicit reliance. I only aſk of him, and every other reader, that they will take the uncorrupted word of God itſelf into their own conſideration, and with diligence ſearch the ſcriptures only, and thence infer, for their own uſe, ſuch tenets as the Holy Spirit ſhall be found to have teſtified.

LXVIII.

St. Paul, in his epiſtle to the Galatians, commences with a declaration that he is "an apoſtle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jeſus Chriſt, and God the Father,") Gal. i. 1. Here the Father and the Son are put into oppoſition to man, and declared to be the Being from whom the apoſtle had his authority; and he declares farther, that "the goſpel which was preached of me, is not after man. For I neither received it of man,

neither

neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt," Gal. i. 11, 12. Who then is Jeſus Chriſt who has thus revealed the goſpel to Paul, and whoſe authority is ſo very high above that of men? One with the Father, God.

LXIX.

"For do I now perſuade men, or God? or do I ſeek to pleaſe men? for if I yet pleaſed men, I ſhould not be the ſervant of Chriſt," Gal. i. 10. This is in context with the laſt cited paſſages, and the apoſtle, ſtill preſerving the diſtinction between God and man, ſhews the Galatians the authority with which he is about to reprove them, and that they may not expect too great lenity, he ſhews that he does not ſeek to pleaſe them, but Chriſt, whoſe ſervant he ſhould not be if he neglected to maintain that goſpel which ſome among them had perverted. He diſtinguiſhes himſelf from thoſe who "deſire to make a fair ſhew in the fleſh, leſt they ſhould ſuffer perſecution for the croſs of Chriſt," Gal. vi. 12; whereas he bore in his body the marks of the Lord Jeſus, ver. 17.

LXX.

"God hath ſent forth the ſpirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father," Gal. iv. 6. There is ſomething very remarkable in the courſe of St. Paul's argument here, and the manner in which he has aſcended to the aſſertion before us. He is ſhewing that the law was given as "a ſchoolmaſter to bring us unto Chriſt, that we might be juſtified by faith," that it was given in the interval of time, between the promiſe and the time of fulfilling it; but by no means with a view of ſupplying the place of that which was promiſed, for it was impoſſible that a law could be given by which righteouſneſs could come; he farther ſays, that, being juſtified by faith, the tuition of the law became unneceſſary, and that being therefore emancipated from the bondage

bondage of the law, " we are made the children of God, by faith in Chriſt Jeſus:" and now he ſays, that the fullneſs of time being come, " God ſent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of ſons." Is not this aſſigning a reaſon wherefore Chriſt took manhood, and particularly why he was ſent to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael? But he has, according to " the goſpel, preached before to Abraham," Gal. iii. 8, ſuffered, and redeemed them, whereby they have been juſtified by faith, and by faith to juſtification become Children of God; and what is now the proceſs? After we have received the adoption of ſons, the ſpirit is ſent forth into our hearts to make us acknowledge him to be God, whom, till he had ſo redeemed us to faith, we had only ſeen to be a man, " made of a woman, under the law." In the paſſage before us, we are told, that God ſent forth the ſpirit of his Son; and by the ſame preacher it is declared to the Romans, that it is by " the ſpirit of him that raiſed Jeſus from the dead, that we are led, in order to be the ſons of God, and that by this ſpirit of adoption we cry, Abba, Father," Rom. viii. 11, 14, 15. That ſpirit, which raiſed Jeſus from the dead, is therefore that eternal, and inviſible, and incomprehenſible God, who was in union with him, while he was living, and who again reſumed our nature upon its reſurrection from the grave. " No man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghoſt," 1 Cor. xii. 3. Through faith then, having received the adoption of ſons, and by the ſpirit of our bleſſed Redeemer ſent forth into our hearts, let us, without heſitation, cry to him, " Abba, Father," and addreſs the Lord's prayer to him, through whom, and by whom only, we have been called ſons, and are enabled to ſay, " that Jeſus is the Lord," " our Father." I muſt obſerve here, that as St. Paul was preach-

preaching to men disposed to Judaism and the doctrines of the law, the spirit of adoption, sent after justification by faith in Christ Jesus, was by no means necessary to induce them to cry Abba, Father, to the God of the Unitarians; for this they were disposed to do before, and not to recede from it. Somewhat not acceded to by the followers of Moses was then the doctrine of the apostle of Jesus Christ; and he therefore teaches, that by faith in him they are justified, and thereby receive the spirit by which they cry to him Abba, Father.

LXXI.

"In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace," Eph. i. 7. "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ," Eph. iii. 8. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you according to the riches of his glory," Eph iii. 14, 15, 16. "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" Rom. ii. 4. "What if God, &c. that he might make known the riches of his glory," Rom. ix. 23. The riches of God and of Christ are here made synonimous terms, and surely the riches of grace, and of glory, and of long-suffering, can only be the attributes of God. But lest it should be doubted what are the unsearchable riches of Christ, St. Paul says, that he prays that his hearers "may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God," Eph. iii. 18, 19; so that all the fulness of God, and the knowledge of

the love of Chriſt, are again made ſynonimous terms. But this fulneſs of God is attained to only by having "Chriſt to dwell in our hearts by faith," Eph. iii. 17; and then when we have attained to this, and "come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God," what is the conſequence? are we then "filled with all the fulneſs of God?" moſt certainly we are, for we come "unto a perfect man, unto the meaſure of the ſtature of the fulneſs of Chriſt," Eph. iv. 13. Unto himſelf St. Paul ſays this knowledge was given, that he might preach the myſtery of Chriſt to the Gentiles, that they ſhould be partakers of the promiſe in Chriſt by the goſpel, "whereof I was made a miniſter, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me," Eph. iii. 7. "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the meaſure of the gift of Chriſt," Eph. iv. 7. "O the depth of the riches both of the wiſdom and knowledge of God! how unſearchable are his judgments, and his ways paſt finding out! for who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counſellour?" Rom. xi. 33, 34. Theſe laſt words afford at once an argument, and no unuſeful leſſon to a reader of the word of the God of truth.

LXXII.

"When he aſcended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he aſcended, what is it but that he alſo deſcended firſt into the lower parts of the earth? He that deſcended, is the ſame alſo that aſcended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things,") Eph. iv. 8, 9, 10. St. Paul ſeems here to enter into the argument, and by the manner in which he puts the above aſſertions, to have confronted himſelf to Mr. Lindſey; from which I conclude that he had at leaſt an equal foreſight of the Lindſeian, as of the Platonick ſchiſm. He foreſaw

that

that our Lord's pre-exiſtence would be denied, and has therefore made his aſcent a proof that he had before deſcended to the earth, (for that is all that is meant by the lower parts of the earth) and had again returned to where he had been before, to heaven. (For that in the ſame manner is all that is meant by, far above all heavens; and the two terms are uſed in order ſtrongly to contraſt his dignity and condeſcenſion). He foreſaw that his divinity would be denied, and has therefore lifted him far above the heavens, and extended him even that he might fill all things. Let us then "henceforth be no more children, toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the ſleight of men, and cunning craftineſs, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. But ſpeaking the truth in love, grow up into him in all things, which is the Head, even Chriſt," Eph. iv. 14, 15.

LXXIII.

"Servants, be obedient to them that are your maſters according to the fleſh, with fear and trembling, in ſingleneſs of your heart, as unto Chriſt: not with eye-ſervice, as men pleaſers, but as the ſervants of Chriſt, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing ſervice, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatſoever good thing any man doeth, the ſame ſhall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free," Eph. vi. 5, 6, 7, 8. If words could be found more explicitly declaring that the ſervant of Chriſt and of God is one, whilſt "no man can ſerve two maſters;" and alſo that the ſervice done as to the Lord, is diſtinct from that which is done to pleaſe men, I ſhould endeavour to paraphraſe this paſſage. I ſhall only now remark, that, in a parallel paſſage to the Coloſſian ſervants, he ſays, inſtead of "with fear and trembling, in ſingleneſs of heart, as unto Chriſt;" "not with eye-ſervice,

as men pleaſers, but in ſingleneſs of heart, fearing God," Coloſſ. iii. 22.

LXXIV.

" Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himſelf of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a ſervant, and was made in the likeneſs of men: and being found in faſhion as a man, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the croſs," Philip. ii. 6, 7. 8. If Mr. Lindſey, who denies not that Jeſus Chriſt was a man, will not deny that he is here declared to be ſuch, I think he cannot deny that he is here declared to be God: for if the words *the form of a ſervant*, *the likeneſs of men*, *and the faſhion of man*, be exactly of the ſame import as an aſſertion that he was actually a man, it neceſſarily follows, that the ſimilar expreſſion, " being in the form of God," muſt have a ſimilar interpretation, and ſignify that he is actually God; and from the whole paſſage our Saviour's pre-exiſtence (in a ſtate of glory) to the time of his being " made man" is ſo neceſſarily deducible, that it cannot be avoided; the condeſcenſion of Chriſt, equal with God, in taking on him a nature ſo inferior as that of man, being the propoſed example of humility, by which we are exhorted to be humble. If this text ſtood without another to ſupport it, it is concluſive for the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt. Being in the form of God, having the ſame meaning as the being actually God, we are thereby enabled to interpret St. Paul's aſſertion that our Saviour " is the image of the inviſible God," Coloſſ. i. 15; and many other paſſages declaring him to be " in the form of God."

LXXV.

" For our converſation is in heaven, from whence alſo we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt," Philip. iii. 20. St. Paul having declared that his expectation

pectation of the Saviour is from heaven, pronounces the Saviour to be Jesus Christ; but to Timothy he says, that he is "an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour," 1 Tim. i. 1. That prayers and supplications, and giving of thanks for all men, "is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour," 1 Tim. ii. 3. "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe," 1 Tim. iv. 10. And to Titus he says, that God "hath in due times manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me, according to the commandment of God our Saviour," Titus i. 3: so that God our Saviour, is the Saviour whose coming from heaven Paul looked for, even Jesus Christ, one with the Father; that God who committed the preaching of his word, and the manifestation of himself to be made in due time, saying, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," Acts ix. 5.

LXXVI.

"Who is the first-born of every creature," Col. i. 15. Instead of conceiving that these words in the least degree derogate from the dignity of Christ as God, or in the least point him out to be even *the first and purest Creature of God*, I believe them to have the very reverse tendency; for from the context we may find St. Paul using the benefit of our redemption thro' the blood of Christ, which he declares to be forgiveness of sins, deliverance from the power of darkness, and translation into the kingdom of the Son, by whom he says, "were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist," Col. i. 16, 17. And this redemption, which is afforded to us, the apostle testifies to be by the blood of the Son, who

is

is the "firſt-born of every creature." By the ſacrifice of Chriſt, and by the ſufficiency of his body once offered, we find the daily ſacrifice for the people taken away, and a full atonement made at once: by his daily prophecies, we find the deſtruction of the Jewiſh temple, and conſequently of the Jewiſh ritual at hand; and the event ſoon juſtified the prophecy; we find their altars and offerings aboliſhed, and their nation ceaſe to be a people peculiar to God: but we find alſo the adoption of all mankind to be, as it were, the children of the promiſe through faith. Now, as the entire hiſtory of the Jewiſh nation is a typical prophecy of our bleſſed Saviour's incarnation, ſufferings, and the adoption of all mankind thro' him, and that their peculiar ſanctity was maintained by blood, and by ſacrifices; ſo we find, that this blood, and theſe ſacrifices were a type of the ſacrifice to be made for all mankind in order to their adoption; for, as the ſacrifice was for an atonement for the ſins and errours of the people, ſo is the ſacrifice of Chriſt, once offered, an atonement for the ſins of thoſe who were thereby adopted. But we find alſo, that the Jews were to be ſanctified by the offering up of the firſt-born to God; and among other parts of their ritual, this ſanctification now no longer ſerviceable, was to be ſet aſide; that event, of which it was a type, having taken place, and our ſanctification to God, by the offering up of Jeſus Chriſt to be "the firſt-born of every creature" being accompliſhed. But it may be ſaid, that the offering of the firſt-born child was long before ſet aſide, and a compenſation taken by God, who accepted of the whole tribe of Levi to be ſervitors in the ſervice of the ark, and afterwards of the temple, inſtead of the firſt-born child through Iſrael. But this very compenſation being now to be ſet aſide, the newly adopted world required a firſt-born after the type of Iſrael, and found it accordingly in Chriſt Jeſus, who

who not only gave himſelf for the whole of mankind, to be "the firſt-born of every creature," but alſo has, inſtead of the Levitical prieſthood, ſtood forth himſelf to be an High-prieſt for us, whom he hath bought with his blood. If this interpretation of the words before us, which is altogether conſonant to the doctrine of St. Paul to the Hebrews, by whoſe rites he declares our Saviour's ſacrifice foreſhewed, be not accepted, let the "firſt-born of every creature" be referred to a declaration in a few verſes after, that Jeſus Chriſt is "the firſt-born from the dead," Col. i. 18. Words ſpoken with reſpect to his reſurrection, whereby our reſurrection to life eternal thro' him is obtained, as he has become the Captain of our ſalvation, our Leader to a triumph over death and the grave, the firſt-born of a regenerate world. No man who ever read the context, and ſaw theſe words joined to a declaration, that by Jeſus Chriſt all things were made, and that by him all things conſiſt, &c. could conceive them intended to convey an idea that "the Creator of all things that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible," was no more than a meer Creature, and the work of his own hands. Some other meaning correſponding to the general ſenſe of the apoſtle muſt be ſought for, and I ſincerely think that I have affixed the true one to the words before us, and am certain that, if I have not, I have not deviated farther from it than they who tranſlate "firſt-born" into "firſt-made." Compaſſion for the unhappy Servetus ſeems altogether to have abſorbed Mr. Lindſey's attention; his death is made into a martyrdom, and his martyrdom into an argument ſufficient to make any thing St. Paul ſays on this ſubject altogether unneceſſary to be enquired into. The little paſſage is taken apart, and an interpretation faſtened upon it, which, when it is reſtored to its original connection, it altogether rejects.

The

LXXVII.

The following is an explicit declaration that Jeſus Chriſt is both God and Man, " for in him dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily," Col. ii. 9.

LXXVIII.

To forgive ſins is the peculiar attribute of him to whom belong mercies and forgiveneſs; and accordingly we are called upon by St. Paul to " put on (as the elect of God, holy and beloved) bowels of mercy, kindeſs, humbleneſs of mind, meekneſs, long-ſuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel againſt any: even as Chriſt forgave you, ſo alſo do ye," Col. iii. 12, 13. This paſſage is immediately preceded by a declaration, that " Chriſt is all in all."

LXXIX.

" Of the Lord ye ſhall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye ſerve the Lord Chriſt. But he that doeth wrong, ſhall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no reſpect of perſons," Col. iii. 24, 25. Before whom is there no reſpect of perſons? certainly before him who is to deal out the reward impartially, whom we ſerve; but we are told that " God will render to every man according to his deeds," " for there is no reſpect of perſons with God," Rom. ii. 5, 11. And in the Epheſians, St. Paul ſays, having called us firſt ſervants of Chriſt," " your Maſter alſo is in heaven, neither is there reſpect of perſons with him," Eph. vi. 6, 9. And accordingly we find St. James ſay, " My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Lord of glory, with reſpect of perſons," James ii. 1.

LXXX.

To the Theſſalonians, St. Paul ſays, " We were bold in our God, to ſpeak unto you the goſpel of God, with much contention," 1 Theſſ. ii. 2. " We were willing to have imparted unto you, not the goſpel of God

God only, but alſo our own ſouls," " for labouring night and day, becauſe we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the goſpel of God," 1 Theſſ. ii. 8, 9. " and ſent Timotheus our brother and miniſter of God, and our fellow labourer in the goſpel of Chriſt, to eſtabliſh you, and to comfort you concerning your faith," 1 Theſſ. iii. 2. If Chriſt be not God, is this the method of eſtabliſhing their faith? no, but of ſhaking it to its very foundation, for the idea that he is God is ſuggeſted by it. Either St. Paul intended to inculcate that doctrine, or he did not; if he did, we muſt accede to it; if he did not, he has lied to the Holy Ghoſt, given " to guide him into all truth," John xvi. 13. or the ſpirit of truth has, by inaccuracy, deceived and dealt by our faith with duplicity. But as Paul has declared his exhortation to have been " not of deceit, nor of uncleanneſs, nor in guile," 1 Theſſ. ii. 3, I will believe that this eloquent apoſtle ſpoke the dictate of the ſpirit without ambiguity; and though Mr. Lindſey has charged the appointed witneſſes of our bleſſed Redeemer with equivocation, I am confident he will not blaſphemouſly dare to impute falſehood to the Spirit of truth himſelf. If Paul then ſpeaking, with the Holy Ghoſt, has ſuggeſted that Chriſt is God, we muſt neceſſarily believe that he meant to inculcate that doctrine, and therefore that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God.

LXXXI.

Reminding the Theſſalonians of his former leſſons, St. Paul ſays, " For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jeſus. For this is the will of God," 1 Theſſ. iv. 2, 3. He then proceeds to inſtruct them in brotherly love, as the will of God, the commandment of the Lord Jeſus.

LXXXII.

" It is a righteous thing with God to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, reſt with us, when the Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: who ſhall be puniſhed with everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he ſhall come to be glorified in his ſaints, and to be admired in all them that believe (becauſe our teſtimony among you was believed) in that day," 2 Theſſ. i. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Seeing then that Jeſus Chriſt is revealed from heaven, taking vengeance, and deſtroying by everlaſting expulſion from before the preſence of the glory of his power; is not he that God with whom it is a righteous thing to recompence tribulation to them that trouble, to them that know him not to be God in obedience to the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, " that the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt may be glorified?" See the entire chapter. The glorification of the name of our bleſſed Lord gives a ſanction to our addreſſing him in theſe words, " Hallowed be thy name," Matth. vi. 9. " The Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed, taking vengeance on them that obey not the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt;" and " what ſhall the end be of them that obey not the goſpel of God?" 1 Pet. iv. 17.

LXXXIII.

" Now our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and God even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlaſting conſolation, and good hope thro' grace, comfort your hearts, and eſtabliſh you in every good word and work," 2 Theſſ. ii. 16, 17. I am not yet going to enquire into Mr. Lindſey's curious doctrine of pious wiſhes, but, excluſive of the general ſenſe of this

paſſage,

paſſage, to make a remark on the great ſingularity of the expreſſion. Either there are two nominatives joined by the copulative "and," or there is but one preceding the verb in the ſentence before us, and in that caſe, the copulative unites two ſpecific terms put in appoſition to the one general nominative; if the former were the caſe, the verb muſt neceſſarily have been put in the plural number, whereas, from its ſtanding in the ſingular, we muſt conceive it governed by one nominative only; now, if there be found one term in the ſentence including the reſt within its general import, that is the nominative caſe governing the verb: But I have all along aſſerted, that the Father is God, and that the Son is God, and therefore now ſay that the word "God," is here that general term comprehending within itſelf, "our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and even our Father," one God, which *hath* loved us, and *hath* given us everlaſting conſolation. St. Paul ſeems to have been diligent to eſtabliſh this point by the energetick addition of the word "himſelf" after the name of our Lord; for thus emphatically to dwell upon a word to be diſmiſſed inſtantly from being of any conſequence in the conſtruction of a ſentence, is a practice unknown to any writer in any language, and ſurely not to be imputed to one of the moſt accurate, conciſe, and obtruſive ſpeakers that ever forced the meaning of words upon the underſtanding of mankind; a preacher who gave words only to his ideas, and never ſought an expletive to grace, much leſs to diſgrace his language, and diſtract his argument. After he had thus given them a bleſſing from his warm and benevolent heart, this excellent man calls upon his hearers for their prayers, and, in conſideration of the benediction that he has already beſtowed on them, "that God ſhould eſtabliſh them in every good word and work," he ſays, "the Lord is faithful, who ſhall ſtabliſh you, and keep you from evil," 2 Theſſ. iii. 3.

LXXXIV.

" And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ;" or, as it ſtands in the margin of the Bible, " the patience of Chriſt," 2 Theſſ. iii. 5. Here is *the Lord*, according to Mr. Lindſey's manner of interpreting, quite neuter, being neither God nor Chriſt, for, apart from both, he is to lead to the love of the one, and to the patience of the other. But I believe this gentleman will hardly inſiſt upon it that he is not either in this paſſage; and if not here, I refer it to the candour of every advocate of the Unitarian ſyſtem, whether a diſtinction between the Father and Son, as God, is intended to be marked in ſuch paſſages as the following: " now thanks be to God which always cauſeth us to triumph in Chriſt," 2 Cor. ii. 14. " In the ſight of God ſpeak we in Chriſt," 2 Cor. ii. 17; and in a multitude of texts, where the diſtinction is marked only as in that before us, where the neuter word *Lord* is certainly both that God and Chriſt from whom he ſeems to be diſtinguiſhed by the action appointed to him.

LXXXV.

" There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Chriſt Jeſus; who gave himſelf a ranſom for all, to be teſtified in due time," 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. Having already commented on the former part of this paſſage, I ſhall not now weary my reader by repetition, but remark that, from a declaration that Chriſt had given himſelf a ranſom to be teſtified in due time, and that that time was now come, in which God our Saviour will have all men come to the knowledge of the truth by the teſtimony of the apoſtolical preaching, with the Holy Ghoſt, Paul inſtantly paſſes on to ſay, that having been himſelf appointed a witneſs of our Saviour, a preacher, and an apoſtle, teaching of the Gentiles in faith and verity, " I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without

without wrath and doubting," 1 Tim. ii. 7, 8. Wherefore? becauſe he is a witneſs to teſtify of Chriſt who gave himſelf a ranſom for all. And how does this authorize him to will that all men ſhould pray? there can be but one anſwer given to this, namely, that he, whom he teſtified, was the proper object of that prayer which he deſired ſhould be preferred, even Jeſus Chriſt, one with the Father, God.

LXXXVI.

St. Paul, about to ſend Timothy to preach "ſound doctrine, according to the glorious goſpel of the bleſſed God, which was committed to his truſt," 1 Tim. i. 10, 11. gives him the following epitome of what he would have him promulgate and teſtify; "Now, without controverſy, great is the myſtery of godlineſs: God was manifeſt in the fleſh, juſtified in the ſpirit, ſeen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory," 1 Tim. iii. 16. What can more demonſtrate the Godhead of him who, having been manifeſt in the fleſh, was witneſſed by the apoſtles to have aſcended into heaven, and who, by them, was now preached unto the Gentiles, than this direct aſſertion, that he, of whom it was aſſerted, was, and is God. And ſhall we now deny that the revelation of godlineſs is a myſtery?

LXXXVII.

Forewarning Timothy of future defection from the truth, and recommending perſeverance, St. Paul ſays, "We both labour, and ſuffer reproach, becauſe we truſt in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, 1 Tim. iv. 10. "This" he declares to be "a faithful ſaying, and worthy of all acceptation;" and in ſo many words he has aſſerted the ſame thing of the following fact, that "Jeſus Chriſt came into the world to ſave ſinners," 1 Tim. i. 15. To be the Saviour then is the common attribute of God and of Chriſt,

who

who is therefore God; for Jesus Christ is not said to have been the means of salvation, which would have better described the instrument of God in our redemption, but he is one and the same Saviour with God. Of the man Christ Jesus of the seed of David, it is indeed said that he was raised from the dead, 2 Tim. ii. 8. But Jesus Christ as God, clothed with eternal glory, is he by whom we have obtained eternal salvation, 2 Tim. ii. 10.

LXXXVIII.

"I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen," 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14, 15, 16. Here even the glory of God, unapproachable by man, is ascribed to Jesus Christ; and this is only ascribable to his divinity, as many men had seen the man Jesus; and St. Paul says, "yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more," 2 Cor. v. 16. That he is the King of kings, and Lord of lords, is not only asserted here, but is in so many terms declared to be the name of Jesus Christ by St. John, Rev. xix. 16. His Godhead is therefore incontrovertibly established here. That St. Paul should speak of the Son only, is an inference naturally resulting from the consideration that he was making out an appointment to Timothy to go and to preach Jesus Christ, of whom he speaks in such terms in the first chapter of this epistle, that I choose to refer to it, rather

rather than make a partial quotation, and the whole is too long to insert. The *pious* wish, or rather let me have liberty to call it the benediction of the apostle, is " grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord;" a wish, which I cannot well imagine how he should expect to have gratified by a mere creature; nay, he says more, that the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant, sets forth, that to his trust was committed the glorious gospel of God, and instantly thanks Jesus for putting him into the ministry; declares Jesus Christ to have come into the world (a phrase extraordinary, if the commencement of our Saviour's life was in the flesh) to save sinners; and having recounted the particular mercy and long-suffering of Jesus Christ toward himself, his gratitude breaks out into a doxology, the object of which must evidently appear to be the same as the Being from whom he received the benefits that invite his praise. " And now" he says " unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory, for ever and ever. Amen." He must be a perverse interpreter who can understand these words in any other sense than that of a declaration that the merciful and long-suffering Jesus, the abundance of whose grace had pardoned his multitudinous persecutions and blasphemies, for a pattern to all who should hereafter believe to life everlasting, " is the King eternal, the only wise God, to whom he ascribes honour and glory, in consideration of the exceedingly great benefits which he had received of him, and which were now so strongly impressed upon his mind, as at once to call forth his acknowledgments and his exulting praise."

LXXXIX.

St. Paul says to Timothy, whom he is sending to " do the work of an Evangelist," " I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and

and his kingdom: preach the word, &c." 2 Tim. iv. 1. And "unto all them that love his appearing," he ſays, "the Lord the righteous Judge ſhall give a crown of righteouſneſs at that day," ver. 8. Here the kingdom, the judgement-ſeat, and the appearing, are aſſigned to Jeſus Chriſt, and the crown of righteouſneſs is conferred on all thoſe who love his appearing, according to what he ſays to Titus, to whom he is giving a like charge: "looking for that bleſſed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," Titus ii. 13. That theſe then are all ſynonimous terms I ſhall not affront the underſtanding of my reader by an attempt to make more evident than it muſt at once appear; and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, God.

XC.

In the charge to Titus laſt cited, St. Paul holds out "this bleſſed hope, and glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," to ſuch as deny worldly luſts, and who, by ſo doing, "adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour," Titus ii. 10. Jeſus Chriſt was the doctrine committed to Titus, and more particularly "how our ſalvation aroſe from his having given himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity;" "that having been diſobedient, ſerving luſts and pleaſures, not our merits, but his mercy ſhone forth in ſaving us:" that therefore, "Jeſus Chriſt having loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his blood," Rev. i. 5. "the kindneſs and love of *God our Saviour* appeared, by waſhing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt; which was ſhed on us abundantly, thro' *Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour*," Titus iii. 4, 5, 6. Here, ſpeaking to a man who was to act under him, and whoſe diſcharge of the office conferred on him, muſt in a great meaſure depend upon the accuracy of St. Paul's expreſſion, this apoſtle, preaching that which was committed to him, according to the com-

commandment of God our Saviour," falls into a mode of expreſſion, which, if Jeſus Chriſt be not God, muſt perpetually miſlead Titus, keep him wandering in continual errour, and utterly incapacitate him to "exhort and convince by ſound doctrine." That mankind had obtained ſalvation, is the committed doctrine; that God is our Saviour, and that Jeſus Chriſt is our Saviour, are ſentences occurring every where through the epiſtle, nay, in contiguous verſes; for, after declaring himſelf an apoſtle by the commandment of *God our Saviour*, St. Paul proceeds to ſay, "To Titus mine own Son after the common faith: grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour*," Titus i. 3, 4. Did he mean to diſtract him? if not, he is very defective in his addreſs; but if he meant to inculcate the divinity of Chriſt, and to ſhew that the Father and the Son are one God, our Saviour, he has ſpoken to the purpoſe, and conſiſtently with the coherent ſtile that ſo exceedingly diſtinguiſhes the writings of St. Paul.

XCI.

"Verily, he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the ſeed of Abraham," Heb. ii. 16. This is urged as a perſuaſive to us to lay hold of and embrace the great ſalvation, afforded to us by ſo wonderful an inſtance of condeſcenſion as that of our Saviour's having taken our nature upon him, which he is declared to have done, that he might, as man, become the Captain of our ſalvation, by ſuffering death for all men. But St. Paul ſays, that he took not on him the nature of angels, but deſcended a little lower: What is this but ſaying, that out of two things equally poſſible to him, he has made a choice? and to that which is not yet uſhered into being, we know that there is not any thing poſſible; therefore Jeſus Chriſt had preexiſtence to the time he came in the fleſh: But he ve-

rily took not on him the nature of angels; therefore, in his pre-exiſtent ſtate, he was not an angel. But while the power of making choice among all inferior natures which he would take was his, he aſſumed that in which a purpoſe beneficial to mankind was to be anſwered; and we are accordingly invited to offer up the tribute of our gratitude and confidence to him who had been thus merciful. But who was he to whom ſuch a choice belonged? Certainly God, to whom alone all things are ſubſervient, "by whom and for whom all things were created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth," Col. i. 16. who can exalt, as well as debaſe, the works of his own hands, and take into himſelf whatſoever nature it ſhall pleaſe him to honour. This ſtupendous dignity he has conferred upon ours; and for our advantage has become man, even the man Jeſus Chriſt. This adopted nature, this progeny of his power and mercy he has declared his Son; and for the ſake of this his "holy child Jeſus," who, notwithſtanding that he was in all points tempted like as we are, continued to the end doing the will of God, ſpotleſs, without ſin, became obedient to the death for our redemption, and having ſuffered, thereby to become the Author and Captain of our ſalvation, accompanied the * reaſcending God into heaven, there for ever to remain our Mediator and Interceſſor; for his ſake, I ſay, has God been pleaſed to extend ſalvation to us; "for this beloved Son, in whom he is well pleaſed," and whom therefore he has eternally united with himſelf, has undertaken the cauſe of our infirmities, and has graciouſly condeſcended to call us brethren; he has even called us ſons; and having taken part in that fleſh and blood whereof we are partakers, pronounced us

* "Now, that he aſcended, what is it but that he alſo deſcended firſt into the lower parts of the earth?" Eph. iv. 8.

us his children; and with more than paternal kindneſs bowed himſelf down to death for our ſanctification, "that he might thereby deſtroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them that, through fear of death, were all their life time ſubject to bondage." See Heb. ii. throughout. Let us then, in memory of that fellowſhip which God himſelf has with us, having been "partaker of that fleſh and blood," through the mercies which he has thereby vouchſafed us, approach the throne of his grace with confidence, "knowing that we have a new and living way conſecrated to us, through the vail, that is to ſay, his fleſh," Heb. x. 20. "And having," therefore, "an high prieſt over the houſe of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full aſſurance of faith," "without wavering;" for if we ſin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, "of the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once," "there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſin, but a fiery indignation ſhall devour the adverſary, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was ſanctified an unholy thing, and hath done deſpite unto the ſpirit of grace; for we know him that hath ſaid, vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompence, ſaith the Lord. And again the Lord ſhall judge his people," Heb. x. throughout.

Where now is Mr. Lindſey's analogy between the offering up of prayer and religious worſhip to Aaron the high prieſt of the Jews, and to our great high prieſt Jeſus Chriſt? between the prieſt "that ſtandeth daily miniſtering and offering oftentimes the ſame ſacrifices which can never take away ſin," and this Man, who, after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſins, for ever ſat down at the right hand of God; who, by one offering, hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified? "For

the law maketh men high prieſts; but the word of the oath which was ſince the law, maketh the Son, who is conſecrated for evermore;" "who, having as a prieſt, once made ſacrifice, having offered up himſelf," is ſet on the right hand of the throne of the majeſty in the heavens, where he has become the mediator of the new covenant; in which he has declared, "I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me a people," Heb. vii. and viii. chap. And he, who has, by his fleſh, broken down the partition wall that divided God and man, and whoſe human nature, perfected by ſufferings for an atonement to reconcile man to God, is now in eternal union with the divine nature, and clothed with the one glory, is ſurely a mediator, a high prieſt, of a dignity to which the poſterity of Aaron never aſpired; "he is a high prieſt in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the ſins of the people;" and he is an object of our adoration and religious worſhip; "for in that he himſelf hath ſuffered, being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted," Heb. ii. 17, 18. To this high honour the glorified body of Chriſt is called, after it had been made perfect, and thence become the author of our ſalvation: whereas of Aaron's prieſthood it is ſaid, that "the ſacrifices which were offered year by year continually," under it, "could never make the comers thereunto perfect," Heb x. 1. Are Aaron and Jeſus Chriſt now equally objects of our adoration? or are we equally to withhold our worſhip from both, him who cannot, and him who can ſuccour us? from him who daily ſhed the inſufficient blood of bulls and goats, for the errours of the people, and from him who aboliſhed the ſacrifice and offering by the one ſacrifice, the one offering of his own "prepared body, which came and bled for us, that we might be enabled to do thy

thy will, O God," Heb. x. 5, 6. that we might be a party to the new covenant? The doctrine of the apoſtle is therefore here manifeſtly, that, inaſmuch as the fleſh and blood of the man Jeſus is now in union with the eternal Godhead, and that in the world he had ſuffered ſo much for us, and had called us brethren, we may entertain great hope in the mercy of him, whoſe experience of human infirmities and temptations, can cauſe him to have compaſſion on us; and therefore we are deſired to call upon God through theſe mercies, through Jeſus Chriſt, his name, as our ranſom from death, aboliſhed by the death of his human body. It is not to "the unlearned reader" that I refer what I have now written, for I do not expect it to have any weight with ſuch as have not read the law of Moſes, and compared the types of the Jewiſh ritual with the great event of which it was the ſhadow; and alſo attended to the courſe of the apoſtle's argument throughout his epiſtle to the Hebrews. Before I conclude this comment I muſt inſiſt upon the circumſtance of the law having been no more than a ſhadow of the things to come, and not the exact portraiture; and therefore cannot refrain from expreſſing my ſurprize at ſeeing Aaron and our bleſſed Lord ſo cloſely brought together and aſſimilated by Mr. Lindſey, who will not admit of even a ſhadowy repreſentation, throughout the law, of that which was to come, when it happens to typify that which oppoſes his own ſyſtem. But as I have the word of God for it, I ſhall venture to aſſert, that the government of the Jews, by God, was an epitome of the government of the afterwards adopted world; that the ſelection of the Jews, for the faith of Abraham their father, was an inſtance of the value of faith in the pure eyes of God, and an epitome of the adoption "of many ſons," to be elected thro' faith in Jeſus Chriſt; that the purifications by blood, and the atonement, by

by ſacrifices for the people, were a type of that great ſacrifice of the body of our Lord, offered once for our atonement, by which we are reconciled and reſtored to that bleſſed hope of everlaſting life, which we had forfeited as heirs to the tranſgreſſion of Adam; for as in Adam all men died, and as the law was given that ſin might abound, ſo by Jeſus Chriſt are all men made alive, and by the abundance of ſin, his grace has the more abounded to us, by faith in our redemption, by the blood of the new covenant, to which the old covenant was a guide, that new covenant, of which the man Jeſus perfected by death, and in eternal union with God, is the mediator. Let us then, on our part, declare, that we will be to him a people, as he has, upon his, promiſed, that he will be to us a God; and let us, when we hear the voice of "the Son of God" from our graves, acknowledge "the God who quickeneth the dead," and "rejoice in the appearing of the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven;" when we conſider that for our ſakes he took our nature upon him, that he might have compaſſion upon our infirmities; and that he is our appointed judge, "becauſe he is the Son of man."

XCII.

As it is already laid down, and, I preſume, well remembered, that all are to be judged by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when he ſhall come in his glory on his own day, with the holy angels, bringing his reward with him, and recompenſing every man according to his works, I ſhall not repeat the proofs of it. "Of the Lord then, whoſe coming draweth nigh," St. James ſays, "be ye patient therefore brethren unto the coming of the Lord; the judge ſtandeth before the door; we count them happy which endure; ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have ſeen the end of the Lord: that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy," James v. 8,

8, 9, 10, 11. The patience of Job is here urged as an example to them who were desirous of hastening the day of the Lord; but the patience of Job was in waiting the end of God, whose pity and tender mercy at length amply rewarded his resignation. The pitiful and tenderly merciful Lord, who shall recompense them who, after the example of Job, and "the prophets, who spoke in the name of the Lord," with patience wait for his own appointed day, is therefore the same God who rewarded Job, and for whose coming the prophets waited. But St. James goes on and says, that with respect to sick persons the elders of the church are to be called for, and to pray over them, "and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up," James v. 14, 15. This is in context with the preceding passage, which renders it manifest who the Lord is that shall hear the prayer of faith, and heal the sick; even the same Lord of whom St. Peter said to Eneas, at Lydda, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole, arise," Acts ix. 34; who said himself to her that, with full assurance of his power, touched but his garment, and had her issue of blood staunched, "daughter, be of good comfort: thy faith hath made thee whole," Luke viii. 48; and who, without the intermediate use of any other name, said to the leper who besought him with a prayer of faith, * "I will; be thou clean," Luke v. 13: of Jesus Christ then we are to ask and have. He therefore is one with the Father, God.

XCIII.

In the commencement of his epistle, James calls himself "a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ," James i. 1. As a reason why we should "not have

* Quere, How does this stand in the French? is it *je souhaite?* or if it be, what does it signify? *See Apology, note, p, 5.*

have the faith of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Lord of glory, with reſpect of perſons," James ii. 1, he ſays, "hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God choſen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promiſed to them that love him?" James ii. 5. "If ye have reſpect to perſons, ye commit ſin," James ii. 9. "For he ſhall have judgement without mercy, that hath ſhewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth againſt judgement," ii. 13.

XCIV.

In order to avoid repetition of arguments already uſed, I ſhall obſerve upon but one paſſage in St. Peter's firſt general epiſtle in its courſe.

"The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am alſo an elder, and a witneſs of the ſufferings of Chriſt, and alſo a partaker of the glory that ſhall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you," "neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being enſamples to the flock. And when the chief ſhepherd ſhall appear, ye ſhall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away," 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, 3, 4. If it be remembered that this charge comes from St. Peter to men engaged in the ſame occupation as himſelf, it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe that he had in mind thoſe words of our bleſſed Lord when he conferred the charge of his flock upon him, which were ſo emphatically ſpoken, and ſo affectingly received by him. After his reſurrection from the dead, Jeſus having on the third time ſhewed himſelf to his diſciples "when they had dined, ſaith to Simon Peter, Simon ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou me more than theſe? he ſaith unto him, yea, Lord; thou knoweſt that I love thee. He ſaith unto him, feed my lambs. He ſaith to him again the ſecond time, Simon ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou me? he ſaith unto him, yea, Lord; thou knoweſt that I love thee. He ſaith unto him,

him, feed my ſheep. He ſaith unto him the third time, Simon ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou me? Peter was grieved, becauſe he ſaid unto him the third time, loveſt thou me? and he ſaid unto him, Lord, thou knoweſt all things; thou knoweſt that I love thee. Jeſus ſaith unto him, feed my ſheep," John xxi. 14, 15, 16, 17. A charge attended by ſuch circumſtances, and repeatedly conveyed in ſuch terms, muſt neceſſarily have been deeply impreſſed on the memory of Peter, who was grieved that he who knew all things ſhould think it neceſſary to renew it a third time. That Peter ſhould therefore ever afterwards conſider the office conferred upon him as that of a ſhepherd, and thoſe to whom he was ſent as the flock of the chief ſhepherd who had committed them to him, is not to be wondered at; and accordingly we find him in another place ſay of him, who had declared himſelf "no hireling, but the ſhepherd, whoſe own the ſheep are; the good ſhepherd, who giveth his life for the ſheep," John x. 13, 14. "Ye were as ſheep going aſtray; but are now returned unto the ſhepherd and biſhop of your ſouls," 1 Pet. ii. 25. So that here is that flock of Jeſus Chriſt, the good ſhepherd, whoſe own the ſheep are, expreſsly declared to be the flock of God. St. Paul too has called "Jeſus Chriſt, that great ſhepherd of the ſheep, Heb. xiii. 20; and ſpeaking to the Epheſian Elders, he deſires them to "take heed to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghoſt had made them overſeers, to feed the church of God," Acts xx. 28. From the chief ſhepherd alſo, when he ſhall appear, we are to receive a crown of glory which fadeth not away. "Bleſſed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried, he ſhall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promiſed to them that love him," James i. 12. This promiſe is explained; "Hath not God choſen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom,

which he hath promiſed to them that love him?" James ii. 5. From whom now are we "* to obtain an incorruptible crown," "a crown of righteouſneſs, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, ſhall give at that day, unto all them that love his appearing?†" Certainly from that God who hath promiſed the kingdom; that Lord who hath promiſed the crown of life to them that love him, ſhall we receive a crown of glory which fadeth not away, when the chief ſhepherd ſhall appear as a righteous judge to give an incorruptible crown of righteouſneſs to all them that love his appearing. This chief ſhepherd is therefore that righteous Judge, that Lord, that God who hath promiſed, and will give a crown of glory to all that love him, even Jeſus Chriſt, one with the Father, God; "to whom be praiſe and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." 1 Pet. iv. 11.

XCV.

The firſt verſe of the firſt chapter of St. Peter's ſecond epiſtle general, has theſe remarkable words, as literally tranſlated in the margin of our Bible. "Simon Peter, a ſervant and apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteouſneſs of our God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," 2 Pet. i. 1. Paul to Timothy, alſo calls himſelf "an apoſtle by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is our hope," 1 Tim i. 1.

XCVI.

"An entrance ſhall be miniſtered unto you abundantly, into the everlaſting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," 2 Pet. i. 11.

XCVII.

"The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens ſhall paſs away with a great noiſe, and the elements ſhall melt with fervent heat;

* 1 Cor. ix. 25. † 2 Tim. iv. 8.

heat, the earth alſo and the works that are therein ſhall be burnt up. Seeing then that all theſe things ſhall be diſſolved, what manner of perſons ought ye to be in all holy converſation and godlineſs, looking for and haſting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire ſhall be diſſolved, and the elements ſhall melt with fervent heat?" 2 Pet. iii. 10, 11, 12. As there is but one day mentioned in this paſſage, it is evident that the Lord, whoſe day it is called in the firſt, is the ſame as the God, whoſe day it is ſaid to be in the laſt verſe; one and the ſame God. But, that the ſpecified Lord, who is God, is our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the context, to which I refer, ſhews beyond contradiction. Beſides other circumſtances evincing this fact throughout the whole chapter, the apoſtle ſays, "the long-ſuffering of our Lord is to be accounted ſalvation; even as our beloved brother Paul alſo hath written unto you," 2 Pet. iii. 15. Now the words of Paul, to which St. Peter here refers, are, "For this cauſe I obtained mercy, that in me firſt Jeſus Chriſt might ſhew forth all long-ſuffering, for a pattern to them which ſhould hereafter believe on him to life everlaſting," 1 Tim. i. 16. Here then, mercy and life everlaſting, which are ſalvation, are preached to all thro' the long-ſuffering of Jeſus Chriſt, after the pattern of Paul, to which Peter has referred, calling him, who is by Paul called Jeſus Chriſt, Lord; and immediately after calling him, whom he had himſelf named Lord, God. Let us not therefore "fall from our ſtedfaſtneſs, but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: to him be glory both now and for ever. Amen." 2 Pet. iii. 18.

XCVIII.

"He is Antichriſt, that denieth the Father and the Son," 1 John ii. 22. How is he who denieth the Father, Antichriſt? How is he who denieth Jeſus to be

the Chriſt, and " confeſſeth not that he is come in the fleſh," to be conſidered as denying the Father? For this plain reaſon, that the Son is one with the Father, God; and conſequently the Father is denied upon the denial of him who is with him, one.

XCIX.

" Every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God," 1 John iv. 3. Though the apoſtle's intention in this verſe be to ſhew that Jeſus Chriſt was truly man, yet it is no ſtrained inference to ſay, that the Being, who came in the fleſh, had pre-exiſtence to the time of taking it upon him; and this indeed follows the more naturally, when we conſider that this denial is made " by the ſpirit of Antichriſt," which denieth the Father and the Son.

C.

As I do believe the 7th verſe of the 5th chapter of St. John's 1ſt epiſtle to be at the beſt a very dubious text, I reſign all advantage that might accrue to my cauſe, from its having come from his inſpired pen. But I ſhall beg leave to expreſs myſelf in the words of it, which very well comprize the concluſion following from the whole of ſacred writ, and which I hope I have rendered obvious by this time. In my own perſon then I ſay that I believe in " the Father, the word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe three are one."

CI.

If words could be found more directly enjoining prayer to Jeſus Chriſt than thoſe which follow, I ſhould endeavour to enlarge on the ſubject; but as the beloved diſciple of our Redeemer has given us the precept, I ſhall leave it to Mr. Lindſey to draw the concluſion, for which he ſtands engaged, and to acknowledge that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God. " Theſe things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know ye have

have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God. And this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we aſk any thing according to his will, he heareth us. And if we know that he hear us, whatſoever we aſk, we know that we have the petitions that we deſired of him," 1 John v. 13, 14, 15. "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God. And whatſoever we aſk, we receive of him, becauſe we keep his commandments," 1 John iii. 21, 22. Here exactly the ſame precept is repeated; but the one Godhead is named in the latter, inſtead of the ſecond perſon of the Trinity ſpecified in the former paſſage.

CII.

"And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding, that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God and eternal life," 1 John v. 20. It is remarkable that this declaration is followed by a deſire to "keep from idols," to the overthrow of whoſe worſhip he preaches the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt, the Son. But leſt it ſhould be ſaid that the elder was inattentive to the conſequence of ſpeaking in ambiguous language to idolaters, concerning the God whom he preached to them, I will produce proofs from the context to teſtify that Chriſt is here ſpoken of, and pointed out for adoration. "He that hath the Son, hath life," and "God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," and "theſe things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life," 1 John v. 11, 12, 13. Theſe words explain who is the true God in whom we have this eternal life; beſides, the gift of underſtanding is an act of Godhead, and is here made to us by the Son. Suppoſe for a moment with Mr. Lindſey that the prophetick

eyes

eyes of the apoſtles were blinded to the opinion afterwards to be entertained by mankind, who have ſince their day believed Jeſus Chriſt to be God, notwithſtanding that they had ſeen him a man born and living amongſt men, even this abſurd ſuppoſition would not extend to St. John, nor indeed to St. Paul, who were themſelves witneſſes of that early hereſy by which the manhood of Jeſus Chriſt was denied, and had heard that body which he had come in, declared only to have been an appearance; ſo that their own living experience might have given them a hint, that accuracy in the application of the terms Lord, and Saviour, and *the like*, was neceſſary, if they had not been the moſt ſtupid as well as wicked men that ever lived on the earth. They were accurate men, they were honeſt men; and by the application of thoſe terms to both the Father and the Son, they have left us an irrefragable proof that the Father and the Son are one God.

The goodneſs of God, and that gracious indulgence with which he has conſulted the infirmities of our ſtate, is, in this reſpect alſo, very ſtrongly diſplayed, that he took manhood on him, in order to give a ſenſible object of worſhip to mankind, incapable of forming any adequate idea of the abſtract God, whoſe qualities are of a nature incomprehenſible by our minds; and not only our natural incapacity to conceive a God purely ſpiritual was conſidered, but the world, merged in idolatry at the time of his incarnation, was mercifully indulged with an object of ſenſe, to which men could look according to habit alſo, and to whom, even by the exertion of the ſame faculties by which they had adopted and adored idols, they could prefer worſhip without the imputation of idolatry. A reſting place is hereby given to the mind, inſtead of its being continued

nued under the neceſſity of launching out into vaſt infinity and eternity, and vainly endeavouring to engage itſelf in the contemplation of matters, of which it can form no idea at all.

CIII.

" Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Chriſt, hath not God: he that abideth in the doctrine of Chriſt, he hath both the Father and the Son," 2 John 9. After having ſhewed who had not God, the elder goes on to ſhew of the direct contrary character, that he hath the Father and the Son, who are therefore that God which abideth in him. " Whoſoever denieth the Son, the ſame hath not the Father," 1 John ii. 23. But " whoſoever ſhall confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God," 1 John iv. 15. " If we love one another, God dwelleth in us," 1 John iv. 12. Who now is the Father and the Son, who dwelleth in us if we abide in the doctrine of Chriſt?

CIV.

" Jude, a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and brother of James, to them that are ſanctified by God the Father," Jude 1. Paul, who has frequently called himſelf both the ſervant of God and of Jeſus Chriſt, (ſee Philip. i. 1, and Titus i. 1.) has in like manner addreſſed the Corinthians, " to them that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus," 1 Cor. i. 1.

CV.

Speaking of the judgement that awaits " ungodly men, turning the grace of God into laſciviouſneſs, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt," " who ſpeak evil of thoſe things which they know not," Jude ſays, that " Enoch alſo, the ſeventh from Adam, propheſied of theſe, ſaying, behold, the Lord cometh with ten thouſands of his ſaints, to execute judgement upon all, and to convince all that are un-

ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard ſpeeches, which ungodly ſinners have ſpoken againſt him." Now we know very well that Jeſus Chriſt is to come to judgement, with the holy angels; that to thoſe who work iniquity he ſhall give everlaſting puniſhment, but unto the righteous, eternal life. We muſt therefore conclude him to have been the object of Enoch's prophecy; and the more ſo, as the apoſtle proceeds to recommend the remembrance and obſervation of what "the apoſtles of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt had ſpoken, that in the latter times there ſhould be mockers, ſenſual, not having the ſpirit," and to deſire that they to whom he writes, "building up themſelves in our moſt holy faith, ſhould pray in the Holy Ghoſt, keep themſelves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, unto eternal life. Now unto him that is able to keep us from falling, to preſent us faultleſs before the preſence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wiſe God, our Saviour, be glory and majeſty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen." See Jude throughout. A comment muſt be unneceſſary here.

As I preſcribed to myſelf the order in which the books of the ſcripture are arranged, and had determined to enquire of the teſtimony afforded by each in its courſe; and as I had but one concluſion in view, to the evidence of which alone proofs were to be brought, my intelligent reader will ſee the impoſſibility of ſtepping from proof to proof in a mathematical proceſs, or of producing an encreaſing teſtimony commencing at a partial, and, in the end, reſulting in a full demonſtration of the truth of that one propoſition, which muſt be rendered equally manifeſt by the firſt, as by the laſt argument in its behalf. That the ſcriptures have declared

clared the divinity of our Lord, it is my office to ſhow; and that this declaration is true, if made, muſt neceſſarily follow, upon the conceſſion that the ſcriptures are the word of God, and therefore true; and as this conceſſion is made, I am only to produce ſuch declarations as are contained in them: this muſt be at once ſeen to preclude progreſſive enquiry. I have, however, for the gratification of my reader, reſerved a very few paſſages, in which it is more directly and literally aſſerted that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God; and with theſe I ſhall cloſe the evidence of the apoſtles, the appointed witneſſes of our bleſſed Redeemer.

CVI.

"Hereby perceive we the love of God, becauſe he laid down his life for us," 1 John iii. 16. The name of "Jeſus Chriſt" does not once occur in the preceding part of the chapter, of which this is the 16th verſe, ſo that it cannot poſſibly be referred to by the pronoun "he;" our Lord and Saviour is therefore literally declared to be God. The courſe of the argument alſo makes a literal interpretation abſolutely neceſſary, for the beloved diſciple is perſuading us to love one another in conſequence of our brotherhood, a motive which God could not have, to love beings ſo infinitely inferior to him; but that God loved us, is manifeſted by his having rendered himſelf ſubject to death for our ſake; we are therefore deſired to love one another, from the equality and ſympathy of our nature: the love of God is perceived, becauſe he laid down his life for us; and therefore, "we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren," 1 John iii. 16.

CVII.

St. Paul preaches thus to the Epheſians, whom he had called to Miletus, and whom he appointed elders over the church to preach the goſpel.

" Take heed therefore unto yourſelves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own blood," Acts xx. 28. What can convince if this be unable? Shall we ſee the blood of God himſelf ſtreaming for our redemption, and ſtill deny that God and man are one Chriſt? or ſhall we not rather ſeek to be of the fold, " return to the ſhepherd of our ſouls," to the " Lord God, who ſhall feed his flock like a ſhepherd? who ſhall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his boſom," Iſaiah xl. 11. But St. Paul foreſaw that men would look upon this poſition, which he has laid down, as a difficulty, which would turn aſide ſuch as yielded not their faith, but ſhould proceed to enquire of the hidden myſtery, and withdraw from the acknowledgment of ſpiritual things, becauſe they were not in poſſeſſion of ſpiritual things to compare with them, whereby they ſhould comprehend the things of God, into which the natural man is unable to enquire; and therefore he has ſaid even to theſe elders to whom he directs his charge, " For I know this, that after my departing, ſhall grievous wolves enter in among you, not ſparing the flock. Alſo of yourſelves ſhall men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things, to draw away diſciples after them," Acts xx. 29, 30. I wiſh that St. Paul may not have had our preſent day in view when he ſpoke thus.

CVIII.

To the Hebrews, St. Paul ſays, that the addreſs from the Majeſty on high to him, " by whom he made the worlds," is, " Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a ſceptre of righteouſneſs is the ſceptre of thy kingdom: And, thou Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt: and they all ſhall wax old as doth a garment; and

and as a veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed: but thou art the ſame, and thy years ſhall not fail," Heb. i. 8, 10, 11, 12. That the attributes here aſcribed, are aſcribable only to God, I believe will not be denied; but they are aſcribed by God himſelf, and to whom? To Jeſus Chriſt, after he had laid aſide the form of a ſervant, and again taken upon him the form of God, the expreſs image of his perſon; when he had by himſelf purged our ſins; and, being the brightneſs of his glory, ſat down on the right-hand of the Majeſty on high. They are aſcribed to Jeſus Chriſt, upon the reaſſumption of that glory which he had laid down, when he was made a little lower than the angels, that, by the grace of God, he might taſte death for every man; that, by ſuffering, he might be made perfect, to lead mankind to ſalvation; to him who had called us brethren, and had now taken up his anointed body, "anointed with the oil of gladneſs above his fellows;" that body, by which he became our fellow, our brother, and our Saviour; and by the aſcent of which he has marſhalled our way to his eternal kingdom. To him, I ſay, who had been partaker of our fleſh and blood, and who, having made himſelf acquainted with our infirmities, has taken into heaven that nature, by which he can be touched with a compaſſionate feeling of them; and has therefore become our "merciful high prieſt and interceſſor," are theſe attributes aſcribed, this addreſs of exultation is made; it is (if I may ſo ſay) the welcome of God to the captain and leader of mankind to glory. And, if I may dare to uſe the expreſſion, we find, as it were, a paſſion of joy in the great God of our ſalvation, at ſeeing the means of his grace take effect in reſtoring mankind to that forfeited happineſs, from which by tranſgreſſion he had fallen; in reconciling him to himſelf; in ſeeing that a paſſage is now open-

ed into his own eternal happineſs to man, by the taking the manhood into God, as the Godhead had before on earth rendered one man a worthy and ſufficient atonement for all men. His grace is now perfected; our nature is ſeated in heaven; and the glory which Chriſt had with the Father before the foundations of the world were laid, is now aſcribed to him; the Father has glorified him with his own ſelf; he is, by the majeſty moſt high, declared to be one with him, declared to be God, whoſe throne endureth for ever, and whoſe years ſhall never fail; the man was ſeen to aſcend; but the God is acknowledged by him to whom alone the God is comprehenſible, "who only knoweth who the Son is." I do not ſee how it is poſſible to avoid, or evade, the ſtrength of this proof, reſulting from the application of theſe words of David to the Son, of whoſe Godhead they are as expreſs a declaration as words can convey. God himſelf acknowledges and declares the ſecond perſon in himſelf; and this in exact conformity with our Lord's own words, upon ſeeing Judas go out with a reſolution to betray him; his hour he knew was now come, and, "therefore, when he (Judas) was gone out, Jeſus ſaid, now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God be glorified in him, God ſhall alſo glorify him in himſelf, and ſhall ſtraightway glorify him," John xiii. 31, 32. And as ſuch a doxology, according to this prediction, comes from God himſelf to Chriſt, I own that to me it appears an impious perverſeneſs to withhold prayer, an impious ingratitude to withhold our praiſe and thankſgiving from him. When we ſee our own ſalvation the ſource of ſuch joy in heaven; when we ſee the infinitely great "maker of all things that are in heaven, and that are in the earth," take ſuch an intereſt in the happineſs of us his very little creatures, we have an additional encouragement to approach the throne of his

mercy

mercy with thanſgiving for our redemption; for which he not only ſuffered, but rejoiced in his ſufferings, and eſteemed them glory for our ſake. "Of Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever," Heb. xiii. 8. Let us then acknowledge, that "of the Jews, as concerning the fleſh, Chriſt came, but that he is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen." Rom. ix. 5.——

I now come to the fourth kind of teſtimony borne to the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, that which he has afforded himſelf, by the revelation made to St. John, after his aſcenſion, and in which he has, in his glorified ſtate, declared his own nature. I do not mean to diſcuſs the prophecy contained in the apocalypſe, but to produce ſuch evidence as the book affords to my point only; ſuch other proofs as are referable to this head, I have noted, as they have occurred in the former parts of this enquiry.

CIX.

Jeſus Chriſt reveals himſelf to St. John in the following words: "theſe things ſaith the firſt and the laſt, which was dead, and is alive," Rev. ii. 8. God ſays to Iſaiah, "I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſides me there is no God," Iſ. xliv. 6. Hence we ſee, that beſides the firſt and the laſt, there is no God: but Jeſus Chriſt ſays, "I am the firſt, and I am the laſt;" the concluſion is, that beſides Jeſus Chriſt, one with the Father, there is no God, and he is the "alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty," Rev. i. 8, and xxii. 13.

CX.

Jeſus Chriſt ſays, "I am he that ſearcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works," Rev. ii. 23. God ſays to Jeremiah,

remiah, " I the Lord ſearch the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings," Jer. xvii. 10. Here God has declared himſelf the ſearcher of hearts. Is there any other ſearcher of hearts? None. But Jeſus Chriſt declares that he is he that ſearcheth the hearts: as there is none other that ſearcheth, and that Jeſus Chriſt has declared that he ſearcheth, Jeſus Chriſt is none other than God Almighty, one with the Father; " the Lord of hoſts, that judgeth righteouſly, and trieth the reins and the heart," Jer. xi. 20; " the Lord of hoſts, that trieth the righteous, and ſeeth the reins and the heart," Jer. xx. 12. And the unity of the Godhead of the Lord, the King of Iſrael, and his Redeemer the Lord of hoſts, is thus aſſerted by the one firſt and laſt; " Thus ſaith the Lord the King of Iſrael, and his Redeemer, the Lord of hoſts, I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſides me there is no God," Iſa. xliv. 6.

CXI.

" I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending, ſaith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty," Rev. i. 8. To the proof already given, that theſe words are ſpoken by Jeſus Chriſt, I will add this, that the declaration follows a deſcription of the coming of the Lord, exactly correſponding to that given by our Saviour of the coming of the Son of man; " then ſhall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they ſhall ſee the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory," Matth. xxiv 30. " Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye ſhall ſee him, and they alſo which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth ſhall wail becauſe of him," Rev. i. 7. He then proceeds to declare himſelf to be the Lord, which is, and which

was,

was, and which is to come: to Jesus Christ the Lord, then, the four beasts "rest not day and night, saying, holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come," Rev. iv. 8.

CXII.

"I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore. Amen." Rev. i. 18. That these words are spoken by Jesus Christ, cannot admit of a doubt. "And when those beasts give glory, and honour, and thanks to him who sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created," Rev. iv. 9, 10, 11. Such is the honour ascribed in heaven to him who is "alive for evermore. Amen." And shall we, who are a part of his creation, "by whom are all things, and we by him," alone withdraw ourselves from the worship of the "one Lord, Jesus Christ," "by whom all things consist?" And shall we not rather join our voice to the voices in heaven, and say, "hallowed be thy name. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven?" Matth. vi. 9, 10; see also 1 Cor. viii. 6, and Col. i. 17.

CXIII.

The following words of our Saviour to St. John, to be delivered by him to the church of Philadelphia, warrant our preferring that petition of the Lord's prayer to him, "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil," Matth vi. 13. "I will also keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth," Rev. iii. 10.

"As

CXIV.

"As many as I love, I rebuke and chaſten," ſays Jeſus Chriſt to St. John, Rev. iii. 19. "Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth," Job v. 17. "For whom the Lord loveth he chaſteneth, and ſcourgeth every ſon whom he receiveth. If ye endure chaſtening, God dealeth with you as with ſons: for what ſon is he whom the Father chaſteneth not?" Heb. xii. 6, 7.

CXV.

"Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the ſeven ſpirits which are before his throne; and from Jeſus Chriſt, who is the faithful witneſs, and the firſt-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth: unto him that loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and prieſts unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. i. 4, 5, 6. If it be allowed that there is an errour in the manuſcript whence our tranſlation of the firſt chapter and fifth verſe of the apocalypſe was taken, there is but very little loſt by the conceſſion; for ſubſtituting the words τῷ αγαπήσαντος καὶ λύσαντος inſtead of the accepted reading τῷ αγαπήσαντι καὶ λύσαντι, and then adopting Mr. Lindſey's own tranſlation, I do not ſee that the doxology contained in the paſſage, is by any means turned away from its proper object, Jeſus Chriſt; for, taking the whole together, it runs thus, "grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the ſeven ſpirits which are before his throne; and from Jeſus Chriſt, who is the faithful witneſs, and the firſt-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth, *who hath* loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins, in his own blood, and hath made us kings and prieſts unto God and

and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. i. 5, 6. It is difficult to imagine how any man ſhould conceive "him" to be referable to any preceding term in the ſentence, beſides that to which the multitude of epithets is referred; and that this is Jeſus Chriſt, does not admit of a doubt. This I ſay even upon a ſuppoſition that Mr. Lindſey has taken the text as it was actually written; but I will now withdraw that conceſſion, upon an aſſurance that the commonly accepted reading is ſupported by at leaſt equal authority as that of Dr. Mill, and that the tranſlators of our Bible have thought it the preferable one. But if I were altogether to relinquiſh this text, which will however admit of no other ſenſe than that I have aſcribed to it, it would avail this gentleman but very little, for the 13th verſe of the 5th chapter affords a doxology which I will not reſign ſo eaſily as he may expect. "Bleſſing and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever," Rev. v. 13. Is this doubtful? No, nor a doubt pretended: but Jeſus Chriſt is in ſight, and therefore, ſays Mr. Lindſey, an object of worſhip. God only, ſays this gentleman in another part of his book, is the proper object of worſhip; but here Jeſus Chriſt in ſight is a proper object of worſhip. I will draw the neceſſary concluſion; therefore Jeſus Chriſt in ſight is God. And, "am I a God at hand, ſaith the Lord, and not a God afar off?" Jer. xxiii. 23. Is this to be acceded to? If Jeſus Chriſt be a creature, he is not an object of worſhip; and my turning my eye upon him can never confer infinity and eternity on that which was before local and temporary; but Mr. Lindſey perſiſting in it that he is a creature, has given the beholders a power of *looking him* into the one Creator. This is too abſurd to dwell on. I ſhall only aſk, if Jeſus Chriſt has not any right to our adoration, how he is

authorized to demand it on ſight? and, if he be in any caſe entitled to our adoration, "the incommunicable honour and prerogative of God alone *," and that therefore he be God, whether it be not the depth of ſtupidity, as well as impiety, to deny that our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God? "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: to him be glory both now and for ever. Amen." ſays St. Peter; and one ſuch declaration, that glory is his for ever and ever, is equal to a thouſand; and, were every other one to be given up, this would remain a ſufficient eſtabliſhment of the eternal glory of Jeſus Chriſt; but, when we find glory once ſo aſcribed, I do not ſee any reaſon for doubting ſuch doxologies as repeat the praiſes of our Lord and Saviour; for, one eſtabliſhing the right, it is but reaſonable to believe, that men, who ſaw with the ſame enlightened underſtanding as Peter did, ſhould equally aſcribe to him the glory which they muſt have equally ſeen to be his due.

CXVI.

"The kings of the earth, &c. hid themſelves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains; and ſaid to the mountains and rocks, fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that ſitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who ſhall be able to ſtand?" Rev. vi. 15, 16. This ſpeaks for itſelf. There is in context with it a remarkable paſſage, by which Jeſus Chriſt, coming to judgement, acts exactly in correſpondence with thoſe words which are addreſſed to him by the Father upon his aſcenſion into heaven; "The heavens ſhall periſh, and wax old as doth a garment, and as a veſture ſhalt thou fold them up," Heb. i. 12. "And the ſtars of heaven fell unto

* Apology, p. 137.

unto the earth, even as a fig-tree caſteth her untimely figs when ſhe is ſhaken of a mighty wind: and the heaven departed as a ſcrowl when it is rolled together," Rev. vi. 13, 14.

CXVII.

"And I ſaw another angel fly in the midſt of heaven, having the everlaſting goſpel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, ſaying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgement is come: and worſhip him that made heaven and earth, and the ſea, and the fountains of waters," Rev. xiv, 6, 7. Paul, who had often termed himſelf "a priſoner of Jeſus Chriſt," Philemon 9. and who tells the Romans, "I am not aſhamed of the goſpel of Chriſt," Rom. i. 16. ſays to Timothy, "Be not thou therefore aſhamed of the teſtimony of our Lord, nor of me his priſoner," 2 Tim. i. 8; and alſo ſays to the Philippians, that though ſome do preach Chriſt out of contention, and ſome of love; yet, being "ſet for the defence of the goſpel; what then? Notwithſtanding every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Chriſt is preached; and I therein do rejoice; yea, and will rejoice," Phil i. 17, 18. Theſe paſſages preciſely aſcertain the meaning of the words *preaching the goſpel*, and ſhew them to be of the ſame import as *preaching Chriſt*, or *bearing the teſtimony of Chriſt*. Now, in the text before us, we ſee an angel flying in the midſt of heaven *to preach the everlaſting goſpel*. And, as we well know that it is "the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom," 2 Tim. iv. 1. what does this cœleſtial harbinger of our Judge proclaim? "Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgement is come." "We have one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. viii. 6.

" All things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt," Col. i. 16, 17. But the angel proceeds, " worſhip him that made heaven and earth, and the ſea, and the fountains of waters." A new and heavenly preacher of the goſpel, that is, of Chriſt, here directly aſcribes to our Judge the name and attributes of God: let us then, upon the teſtimony of this herald, " fear and give glory to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt," the final preacher of whoſe goſpel has declared him to be one with the Father, God.

CXVIII.

" The lamb ſhall overcome them: for he is the Lord of Lords, and King of kings," Rev. xvii. 14. " The King of kings, and Lord of lords" appears again in the 19th chapter and 16th verſe, mounted upon a white horſe, and followed by the armies in heaven; he is aſſailed by the beaſt, and the kings of the earth, and their armies; but the beaſt is taken, and his armies are overcome; and " the remnant were ſlain with the ſword of him that ſat upon the horſe; and all the fowls were filled with their fleſh," Rev. xix. 21. In the 17th verſe of this chapter, before the war, in which the King of kings and Lord of Lords overcame and ſlew the beaſt, and the armies, and the kings, " an angel cried with a loud voice, ſaying to all the fowls that fly in the midſt of heaven, come and gather yourſelves together unto the ſupper of the great God; that ye may eat the fleſh of kings, and the fleſh of captains, and the fleſh of mighty men, and the fleſh of horſes, and of them that ſit on them, and the fleſh of all men, both free and bond, both ſmall and great," Rev. xix. 17, 18. The war immediately enſues; and he that ſat upon the horſe, having overcome and ſlain thoſe who came againſt him, " filled all fowls with their fleſh;" ſo that we find that ſupper given to them by the King

of

of kings, and Lord of lords, to which they are invited by an angel as to the ſupper of the great God. Him then we muſt believe to be the great God, who ſupplied it to them who were called to come to it: but Jeſus Chriſt ſupplied it to them; Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, that great God.

CXIX.

"His name (that ſat upon the horſe) is called the Word of God," Rev. xix. 13. As there is not the leaſt doubt that it is Jeſus Chriſt who ſat upon the horſe, we may venture to explain the beginning of the firſt chapter of St. John's goſpel by this declaration, that "his name is called the Word of God;" and whatſoever is there ſpoken of the Word of God, muſt be allowed to have been ſaid of him who ſat upon the horſe, even Jeſus Chriſt, "the victorious Lamb, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;" and there it is expreſsly declared that "the Word was God," John i. 1; that "the Word was made fleſh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory," John i. 14; that "the ſame (Word) was in the beginning with God, and that by him, who was in the world, and who came unto his own, the world was made," John i. 2, 10, 11. And as "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," Gen. i. 1. "that all things were made by him (the Word); and without him was not any thing made that was made;" that "in him was life, and the life was the light of men," John i. 3, 4. To the ſame purpoſe are the following texts: "I am the light of the world," ſays our Lord; and "he that followeth me, ſhall not walk in darkneſs, but ſhall have the light of life," John viii. 12. "We declare unto you, that God is light," ſays the ſame Evangeliſt, 1 John i. 5. "We have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life; (for the life was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it, and bear witneſs, and

ſhew

ſhew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifeſted unto us)" 1 John i. 1, 2. "God was manifeſt in the fleſh," ſays St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 16; and that "the Word of God liveth and abideth for ever," is the declaration of St. Peter, 1 Pet. i. 23. "Through faith we underſtand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God," Heb. xi. 3. "By whom alſo he made the worlds," Heb. i. 2. Here every attribute of God is aſcribed to the Word of God, to have been from the beginning; to have been the original and author of all created things; or, to uſe St. John's expreſſion, "the beginning of the creation of God," Rev. iii. 14; to have life in him, and to be the light. But it is farther added, that this Word came in the fleſh, in which it was manifeſt, ſeen, and handled in the world; this therefore is evidently ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt. But the Word of God (here ſeated on a horſe, and declared to be Jeſus Chriſt himſelf under that appellation) is expreſsly ſaid to be God: Jeſus Chriſt therefore being that Word manifeſt in the fleſh, and that Word being God, Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, God. The goſpel is the teſtimony of Chriſt, "but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the Word which by the goſpel is preached unto you," 1 Pet. i. 25. John Baptiſt was certainly the appointed forerunner of our Lord, and it was of him therefore that John gave teſtimony. "John bare witneſs of him," John i. 15. It is very remarkable that theſe words are not once preceded, in St. John's goſpel, by the name of Jeſus Chriſt; but that they immediately follow a declaration, that "the Word was made fleſh and dwelt among us;" the Word therefore is Jeſus Chriſt, and "the Word was God;" Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, God.

As to Mr. Lindsey's laborious dissertation on the Chaldee Targums and the word Mimra, I have nothing to say to it, it does not properly come within my province; one short remark, however, I will make on it. If the word Mimra signify both "word and self," as it is certain that Jesus Christ is "the word of God," the word being the same as the self of God, Jesus Christ is therefore the "self of God; or, to use a more common expression, Jesus Christ is therefore God's own self *. This I infer from Mr. Lindsey's own premises; and so obvious is the conclusion from the manner in which he has supplied them from half a dozen writers, that I wonder how it escaped even his own observation. I will take occasion here to say, that I wave all advantage that I might derive from the idiomatick plurals of the Hebrew language (if only idiomatick they be) preceding verbs of the singular number. They may afford argument to those who, with better knowledge than I am possessed of, shall look for it among them: but I am in pursuit of truth, and not of system; I am in pursuit of truth too momentous to be trifled with, and, while I call upon men to yield their assent to a proposition essential to the happiness of their immortal souls, God forbid that I should knowingly call one sophism into proof, or offer that as argument to my readers, which did not carry conviction to my own breast. At the same time that I relinquish this argument, it is but for myself I do, or can relinquish it.

CXX.

When Mr. Lindsey has declared the office of a priest to be "to offer up the prayers of others," Apol. p. 127, he should not therefore have precluded prayer to Christ, and the practice of making him the object of religious worship, unless he were very certain that no priesthood had been appointed to him; but "they shall be priests of God and of Christ," Rev. xx. 6. I have brought this

* Glorify thou me with thine own self, John xvii. 5.

this verſe to eſtabliſh the Divinity of our bleſſed Redeemer, upon a foundation which negligence or blinded prejudice overlooked; but upon which I now demand the acquieſcence of the Unitarians in the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt; we ſee it allowed an argument if it can be brought, and here it is for them. It is remarkable alſo that theſe prieſts of Chriſt are thoſe who are partakers of the firſt reſurrection, of whom it is ſaid "that they are bleſſed and holy:" to thoſe then who are bleſſed and holy we have reaſon to conclude, that this myſtery of the Godhead of Chriſt will be more manifeſtly diſplayed than to us, who are yet to taſte of death. Surely there can be no more uncomfortable conviction than that all the ſtores of God's wiſdom are open to us here, and that in a future ſtate there can be found nothing to add to knowledge; the very expectation of ſeeing farther into the government of the univerſe, directed by power and wiſdom that are infinite, is a motive to obedience; and a full inſight into a myſtery which is the means of our own entrance into eternal happineſs, is a hope ſo delightful in itſelf, that it ſhould make us thankful for ſuch a revelation as intimates it to us, yet withholds the full manifeſtation for a part of our reward "who wait patiently the coming of the Lord," "for behold, we count them happy which endure," James v.

Jeſus Chriſt was indeed on earth a prieſt, and accordingly here diſcharged his ſacerdotal office, by offering up the one ſufficient ſacrifice of himſelf for all mankind, and "by the blood of ſprinkling, that ſpeaketh better things, than that of Abel," which cried from the ground, he has made us a party to the covenant of which he is himſelf the mediator; and by his blood which does not cry againſt us, but on the contrary maketh interceſſion for us, (that body from which it was poured out being our expiation) he has extended ſalva-

tion

tion to all that believe on him. The writer to the Hebrews has ſo clearly pointed out to them how their own ritual was a type of Chriſt's prepared body and blood ſhed as a ſacrifice for the ſins of all men; ſo literally pronounced him our atonement; and ſo explicitly laid open the nature of his prieſthood, and the ſubſequent mediation of his ſufferings in our behalf; that I ſhould aſk my reader's forgiveneſs for ſo frequently entering into that ſubject: but when the whole doctrine of atonement by the death of our Saviour is denied, and that he is declared to have died only as a proof that he had lived, I cannot but think it neceſſary to ſpeak of it, as the occaſion offers, in the courſe of my enquiry; and the rather, when I conſider how vaſtly more probable it is, that even my book ſhall be read by the Unitarians than the Bible.

CXXI.

"And I ſaw the dead, ſmall and great, ſtand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of thoſe things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the ſea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were caſt into the lake of fire; this is the ſecond death. And whoſoever was not found written in the book of life, was caſt into the lake of fire," Rev. xx. 12, 13, 14, 15. I need not repeat the numerous paſſages in which it is ſet forth, that "the Son of man ſhall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then ſhall he ſit upon the throne of his glory. And before him ſhall be gathered all nations; and he ſhall ſeparate them one from another," Matth. xxv. 31, 32. "Then ſhall he (the Son of man) reward every man according to his works," Matth. xvi. 27; and

 that

that " things which offend, and them that do iniquity; he (the Son of man) ſhall caſt into a furnace of fire; there ſhall be wailing and gnaſhing of teeth," Mat. xiii. 41, 42. Here every act of our Saviour's office as the judge of the world, who has declared his own determination to call all fleſh to account, is given to God, before whom St. John ſees the dead, ſmall and great, ſtand, and all nations gathered to receive judgement, " every man according to his works," and by whom " they that do iniquity" " are caſt into a furnace of fire." There can be no truth in ſuch a viſion, if it be not that the very ſame thing is preſented to the view of St. John, which is foretold by our Saviour; and that he who declared that he would judge, even Jeſus Chriſt, has, according to his declaration, proceeded to judge, and to teſtify himſelf to be one with the Father, God. The book of life is ſaid, in another place, to be " the Lamb's book of life," Rev. xxi. 27. It is declared that, " the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement unto the Son," John v. 22. And a reaſon is given for this appointment, " (the Father) hath given him (the Son) authority to execute judgement alſo, becauſe he is the Son of man." As the Son of man only he could receive an appointment, and to him who, as a Son of man, has called us brethren, and can have a feeling of our infirmities, it is moſt mercifully made. All men are here aſſembled to judgement before the great God; but " the Father judgeth no man;" before the Son then are they aſſembled: but they are before God; the Son therefore is one with the Father, God.

CXXII.

" The Lamb which is in the midſt of the throne, ſhall feed them, and ſhall lead them unto living fountains of waters," Rev. vii. 17. Jeſus ſaid to John, " I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end,

the

the firſt and the laſt," Rev. xxii. 13. "And he (that ſat upon the throne) ſaid unto me it is done. I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end: I will give unto him that is athirſt, of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh, ſhall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he ſhall be my Son," Rev. xxi. 6, 7. Here every attribute of him who has called us, if we ſhall prove victorious, his ſons, is equally the Son's as the Father's; he is enthroned; he leads to the living fountains of water, and he is the one firſt and laſt; therefore he is with the Father, one God. What an invitation do the Unitarians decline!

CXXIII.

In the holy Jeruſalem, "I ſaw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the ſun, neither of the moon to ſhine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof," Rev. xxi. 22, 23. "For the Lord God giveth them light," Rev. xxii. 5. "The throne of God and of the Lamb ſhall be in it; and his ſervants ſhall ſerve him, and they ſhall ſee his face; and his name ſhall be in their foreheads," Rev. xxii. 3, 4. Here God and the Lamb are but one temple, ſhed one light, which is the one incommunicable glory of God, and poſſeſs one throne, preſent one face to the view of *his* ſervants, and *his* ſervants ſerve *him*, that is God and the Lamb, ſpoken of in the ſingular number as but one God. To the trinal unity of God, then I am not afraid to aſcribe the excellent doxology of Dr. Tucker, who, when he uſed it, remembered that there *is* but one God, and that there *are* three perſons; "to *him* therefore, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, let theſe miracles of divine mercy be ever aſcribed; and to *them* be glory, praiſe, majeſty, and dominion, both now and for evermore." "The perſonal pronoun *him*," ſays Mr. Lindſey, "evi-

 denly

dently points to one perſon, one individual intelligent agent *;" ſo that as God and the Lamb are, in the paſſage before us, pointed to by this ſame perſonal pronoun *him*, let God and the Lamb, even Jeſus Chriſt, be acknowledged to be one individual intelligent agent, one God bleſſed for ever. "I will write upon him my new name," ſays our Saviour, Rev. iii. 12. "A Lamb ſtood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thouſand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads," Rev. xiv. 1. Conformable to the ſuperſcription of the name of the Father, and the new name of the Son, our Lord ſays, "I will write upon him the name of my God," Rev. iii. 12.

CXXIV.

The angel who ſpoke to John, and ſignified to him thoſe things which he was ſent by Jeſus Chriſt to reveal to his ſervant John, Rev. i. 1. teſtifies as follows, "the Lord God of the holy prophets ſent his angel to ſhew unto his ſervants the things which muſt ſhortly be done," Rev. xxii. 6. And our Saviour immediately after, ſpeaking of this very angel, which has ſaid that he was ſent by, and has called himſelf the angel of the Lord, declares, "I Jeſus have ſent mine angel to teſtify unto you, theſe things in the churches," Rev. xxii. 16. Jeſus Chriſt, who ſent his angel, which was ſent by the Lord God, is therefore one with the Father, the Lord God.

CXXV.

Such farther evidence as I mean to produce from the holy ſcriptures, to prove the Godhead of our gracious Redeemer, I ſhall reſerve till I come to conſider and confute the arguments by which Mr. Lindſey has endeavoured to depoſe him from the throne of his glory: and as I cloſed the apoſtolical teſtimony of our Saviour's divinity, by ſhewing that the appointed witneſſes of Jeſus

* Apology, p. 199.

ſus Chriſt had brought God himſelf to ſpeak the fact, and to pronounce that he who had been ſlain, and had taken that body, by the blood of which we are cleanſed, into heaven, there for ever to remain, is one with himſelf, "God Almighty, whoſe throne endureth for ever and ever, and the ſceptre of whoſe kingdom is a ſceptre of righteouſneſs;" ſo I ſhall conclude this chapter by bringing together thoſe doxologies with which all things both in heaven and in earth have glorified the Son of man; and if by theſe alſo, the kingdom, and the power, and the glory be aſcribed to him, who, of ranſomed mankind, admitted to fellowſhip with him, can then refuſe to "magnify the name of the Lord Jeſus," and to unite his voice with "ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands of angels, who reſt not day and night, ſaying, holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and which is, and which is to come," "worthy art thou, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power *," "worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain to receive power, and riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honour, and glory, and bleſſing †," "and with every creature which is in heaven and in earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and all that are in them, ſaying, Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that ſitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. Amen ‡." "Salvation to our God which ſitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb §," "which is in the midſt of the throne ‖?" for ſuch is the ſong of angels, and of every creature "created by him, and for him **; ſuch are the grateful hymns of thoſe who are redeemed by the blood of the "ſlaughtered Lamb ††," which have come out of great tribulation, and have waſhed their robes, and made them white in the blood of

* Rev. iv. 8, 11. † Rev. v. 12. ‡ Rev. v. 13.
§ Rev. vii. 10. ‖ Rev. vii. 17. ** Coloſſ. i. 16. †† Iſ. liii. 7.

of the Lamb," and who " therefore are before the throne of God, and ſerve him night and day in his temple," " a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues ſtanding before the throne, and before the Lamb clothed with white robes *". To theſe the glorious company of the apoſtles have added their praiſe, ſaying " to the King of kings, and Lord of lords †," " who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath ſeen, nor can ſee, be honour and power everlaſting. Amen ‡." " To our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt be glory both now and for ever. Amen §:" " to whom be praiſe and dominion both now and for ever. Amen ‖." " Wherefore ſeeing we alſo are compaſſed about with ſo great a cloud of witneſſes, let us lay aſide every weight, and the ſin which doth ſo eaſily beſet us, and let us run with patience the race that is ſet before us, looking unto Jeſus, the author and finiſher of our faith, who, for the joy that was ſet before him, endured the croſs, deſpiſing the ſhame **," which was undergone for our redemption; and let us " with every tongue confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, with every knee, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, bow our knee alſo at the name of Jeſus ††;" and knowing that the ſame Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him, let us alſo call upon the name of the Lord, and be ſaved; and to him that ſitteth on the throne, and the Lamb, one God, the Father and the Son, with the whole hoſt of heaven and earth, and all created beings, join in aſcribing " bleſſing and honour, and glory, and power. Amen."

CHAP.

* Rev. vii. 9, 14, 15. † Rev. xvii. 14. ‡ 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.
§ 2 Pet. iii. 18. ‖ 1 Pet. iv. 11. ** Heb. xii. 1. †† Phil. ii. 10.

CHAP. IV.

Controverted Evidence of our Saviour's Divinity eſtabliſhed.—Objections anſwered.—The Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt proved from the Scriptures.

"RELIGIOUS worſhip," ſays Mr. Lindſey, "is the incommunicable honour and prerogative of God alone," Apology, p. 137. Among the multitudinous proofs which I have already given of our Lord's divinity, I have produced many inſtances of prayer, of praiſe, and thankſgiving, preferred to him both in earth and in heaven; by angels and thoſe who have already become partakers of the benefits of his paſſion in heaven; and in earth, by men filled with the Comforter, the holy ſpirit of truth, to whom "the teſtimony of Jeſus" * was given. Theſe I look upon to be acts of religious worſhip; but this honour and prerogative of God alone is aſcribed to Jeſus Chriſt; it is incommunicable, and muſt therefore perfectly and eſſentially diſtinguiſh the poſſeſſour; but Jeſus Chriſt is the poſſeſſour; Jeſus Chriſt is therefore one with the Father, that God alone whoſe incommunicable honour and prerogative it is to be the object of our religious worſhip and adoration.

Mr. Lindſey is ſo exceedingly anxious to emancipate himſelf from the ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe ſervant and Priſoner Paul declares it is his joy and glory to be; he bends ſo reluctantly under the eaſy yoke, the light burden of the goſpel; he ſo boiſterouſly daſhes about the bonds of peace, and ſo fretfully endeavours to caſt the cords from him; and with ſuch a foaming hydrophobia flies from "the fountains of living waters," that he has really become a very melancholy ſpectacle, and therefore

* Rev. xix. 10.

fore I feel it a duty incumbent upon me to force, as ſtrongly as I can, this conviction upon him, that if he will drink of theſe waters, they will refreſh him, and he ſhall not thirſt again; that if he return to Chriſt, the great ſhepherd and biſhop of our ſouls, however ſorrowful and heavily laden he may be, he ſhall find reſt to his ſoul; that if he knock, Chriſt ſhall open; and, that "if he aſk any thing according to his will, the Son of God will hear him, and he ſhall have the petition that he deſired of him *," Let me therefore now, preſuming that Chriſt at hand is not different from Chriſt afar off; and that no merits can put any created being into poſſeſſion of the incommunicable prerogatives of God, or render inferior natures worthy of the honour which belongs to God alone, recapitulate, and once again preſent him with an inſtance of each; of prayer, by that of Stephen, "Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit;" "Lord, lay not this ſin to their charge." Of praiſe, by that in the Revelation, "Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever;" "ſalvation to our God which ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb;" and of thankſgiving, by that of St. Paul, "I thank Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the miniſtry."

There is yet another ſpecies of religious worſhip, which I have intentionally omitted to take notice of in its courſe; it is Benediction; and my reaſon for deferring to obſerve upon it, is, that it demanded a ſeparate conſideration, on account of Mr. Lindſey's doctrine concerning it. He denies benediction to be any evidence at all; and, till I had eſtabliſhed its competency, it is therefore eaſy to ſee I ſhould have produced it out of its place before. Mr. Lindſey's aſſertion, Apology, p. 131,

* 1 John v. 14.

p. 131, concerning such passages as 1 Cor. i. 3. * is, "that they are only pious wishes, not prayers." Admitting for a moment only this distinction between prayers and pious wishes, and the conclusion thence inferred, I believe these same pious wishes will be found to be very impious wishes, and a wish that God should have an assistant in conferring blessings on mankind, be acknowledged rather derogatory from the all-sufficiency of his power: but I do not see how any inference can be drawn from a wish different from that which follows from a prayer, they both equally acknowledge the power which they desire to have put into exertion; and if the power be acknowledged by a declaration of it to a third person, entrusted with an assurance that I wish it to be exerted, I cannot imagine why the possessor of it should not be addressed and let into the secret also, he may not else know my mind, and the power may not therefore be quite so beneficially exerted as I could piously wish. Is it that a Being, whose power is to be acknowledged adequate to the gift of blessings, is unintelligent and unable to hear our prayers? or are we not to address him, because he is unable to grant them? If the latter, we reject our own conclusion, and waste our wishes; and I believe the inconsistency of the former supposition is too apparent to require a comment. The same consequence is inferred, I say, by our wishes as by our prayers, and if the power of God is acknowledged by prayer to be in Jesus Christ, by our wishes also that he would exert that power, it is equally acknowledged; so that even this (I think disingenuous) evasion will not invalidate the force of that testimony which is afforded to this dreaded position, that Jesus Christ is one with the Father, God, by the benedictions of the apostles, the appointed witnesses of our Lord.

* "Grace *be* unto you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

Of theſe benedictions I need only produce one from St. Paul, becauſe it comprehends in it the ſubſtance of all the reſt, which he has beſtowed upon his hearers, "Grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour," Titus i. 4. From God alone can the bleſſings of grace, mercy, and peace proceed; but I will ſhew that they have all proceeded from Jeſus Chriſt; for St. Paul himſelf, who knew the ability of him whom he thus invoked, and that "he is able to ſuccour," ſays, "I thank Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the miniſtry; who was before a blaſphemer, and a perſecutor, and injurious, But I obtained *mercy*, becauſe I did it ignorantly in unbelief: and *the grace of our Lord* was exceeding abundant," 1 Tim. i. 12, 13, 14. Here we find grace and mercy beſtowed by the ſearcher of hearts, who, thro' the veil of blaſphemy and perſecution, diſtinguiſhed that faith which enabled Paul to be put into the miniſtry by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. We do not find this accurate apoſtle ever ſay grace, mercy, and peace from Apollos or Cephas; he knew that they, on whom he beſtowed his bleſſing, were not of Apollos nor of Cephas, who were only fellow-labourers with himſelf; and that, had he been to the end of time calling down grace and mercy from them, they had it not to impart; from Chriſt, that God who gave the encreaſe, when they watered what he himſelf planted, he called for bleſſings; from God alone, to whom belong mercies, it was fit that he ſhould call them down, becauſe that he alone could anſwer and confer them. "My peace I give you," ſays Jeſus Chriſt, "not as the world giveth give I," John xiv. 27. If grace, mercy, and peace then be in the power of our gracious and merciful Redeemer to beſtow, every benediction of the apoſtle of the goſpel of peace is to be conſidered as a ſhort prayer preferred

ferred to him; and benedictions being thus considered as a part of religious worship, it is easy to see the conclusion, that Jesus Christ, to whom it is offered, is one with the Father, that God, whose incommunicable prerogative and honour religious worship is. "Let us therefore, beloved," "being called unto the grace of Christ," Gal i. 6. "not separate ourselves, having not the spirit, but building up ourselves on our most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep ourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life," Jude 19, 20, 21; and "believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved," Acts xv. 11.

But it has been said that the interposal of the conjunctive *and*, enumerates distinct natures between the Father *and* Son; and that grace, mercy, and peace may proceed from, or glory, honour, and dominion be ascribed to one part of the subject, without affecting the other. Not to insist on the absurdity of introducing a name, to say nothing about it, in any proposition; on other grounds also, the distinction between God *and* Lord, how well soever it may have been supported by an epigram *, seems to me not only weak but insincere. "From God the Father *and* our Lord Jesus Christ," are words that occur perpetually in St. Paul's epistles; and I think that candour will allow that "the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ," are, in such passages, put in apposition to "God," and mark a distinction of persons indeed, but undoubtedly an unity, an identity of Godhead; for, were that copulative *and* to be taken as a mark of any other distinction, and insisted on as introductory of a second power, however subordinate it may be to the Father, and acting under him; the consequences of such a manner of understanding it might prove very fatal to the cause it is brought to support; for the same copulative is used by St. James,

* Apology, p. 6.

in a manner that would deſtroy the Godhead of the Father himſelf; for by it the word "Father" is ſet apart from God. He ſays, "true religion, and undefiled before God *and* the "Father," where the copulative is uſed exactly in the ſame manner as by St. Paul: If it be admitted then that the perſonal terms ſtand in appoſition to the general name of "God," all is at once accounted for; whereas, on the other hand, if it be inſiſted upon, that, in the one caſe, the conjunctive enumerates diſtinct natures, a conſequence will neceſſarily follow, which even an Unitarian would ſtart at drawing from it. St. James does not ſtand alone in this manner of diſtinguiſhing between God *and* the Father; St. Paul has afforded many inſtances of a like nature, "giving thanks to God and the Father," Col. iii. 17. "Now, God himſelf, and our Father, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, direct our way unto you," 1 Theſſ. iii. 11. "In the ſight of God and the Father," 1 Theſſ. i. 3. How uncandidly then does even this honeſt and diſintereſted man deal by himſelf, in making uſe of, or yielding his aſſent to ſuch weak ſophiſms; but I am ſorry to ſay that every thing ſeems an argument in his eyes, that only appears to make againſt "the acknowledgment of the myſtery of God, and of the Father, and of Chriſt," Col. ii. 2. "Now, unto God and our Father, be glory for ever and ever. Amen." Phil. iv. 20*.

In

* If it be inſiſted upon, that the following words, "Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt," have any other meaning than that the Father and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt are the one God, by which name the three perſons of the Trinity is comprehended, I ſhall inſiſt upon the diſtinction between "God and the Father" here, and maintain that they have diſtinct meanings alſo, and that the Father is therefore not intended by the word God in this doxology.—But in that caſe the word God is without any meaning at all. To this I anſwer, that it has a meaning, and ſignifies the Son, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to whom, as well as to the Father, glory is aſcribed. I give Mr. Lindſey his choice how he will interpret; for, let him take it either way, the divinity of our Lord follows.

In the Jewiſh ritual, the neceſſity of repeating the ſacrifice is made uſe of as a proof of the inſufficiency of any ſingle victim, to eſtabliſh thoſe who came to the altar: for, had any one offering been anſwerable to ſo great an end, the daily ſacrifice had been taken away, that work for which it had been appointed being finiſhed. Juſt ſuch is the caſe with Mr. Lindſey's arguments; the ſacrifice of to-day manifeſted the weakneſs of the ſacrifice of yeſterday; and the offering now made upon the altar of ſophiſtry, manifeſts the inſufficiency of that which has preceded it, to eſtabliſh the votary, that doctrine, of which he ſtands the prieſt; it acknowledges the weakneſs of the prieſthood, and that it is not faultleſs; like that of the Jews, therefore, I entertain a chearful hope that the whole ſhall at length vaniſh away. This gentleman, accordingly, very juſtly conſidering all that he has already urged as no argument at all, proceeds to inſinuate, rather than ſay, (for he has not put it into ſo many words) that the junction of the name of Chriſt, in doxologies and benedictions, with the name of God, which is invoked or glorified in them, does not afford any proof that Jeſus Chriſt is God, becauſe that to their names ſometimes other names alſo are joined. Had the fact been as here ſtated, I ſhould have allowed it ſome weight, and therefore looking on it as material, I did literally "ſearch the ſcriptures," and throughout could find but that one inſtance in which Mr. Lindſey has exemplified the rule. It is the benediction of St. John in the firſt chapter and fourth verſe of the Revelation, "Grace be unto you, and peace from him which was, and which is, and which is to come, and from the ſeven ſpirits, which are before his throne; and from Jeſus Chriſt," Rev. i. 4, 5. And here it muſt be granted, that unleſs the ſeven ſpirits be God alſo, the junction of the name of Jeſus Chriſt is not a proof that he is God; but I

may

may poſſibly ſurprize Mr. Lindſey by an aſſurance that theſe ſeven ſpirits alſo are God; and this is a poſition eaſily explained to any man who remembers that "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord*;" "The ſeven ſpirits are the eyes of the Lamb†;" and grace, in the eyes of the Lamb, is ſurely a bleſſing devoutly to be implored, when we conſider who that Lamb is, even our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, "the Lord of Lords;" and when we reflect on the advantages that accrued to Noah from his having found favour in his eyes before. According to Mr. Lindſey's mode of arguing, we might as well declare that St. Paul meant to diſtinguiſh between God and the hands of God, when he ſays, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," Heb. x. 31. For, if theſe terms be not only different appellations of the ſame Being, I will then allow that to find grace from God, and from the eyes of God, have likewiſe diſtinct meanings.

This is the only benediction againſt which this charge is brought, and I hope I have ſhewed its inability to affect the Godhead of our bleſſed Lord; had it been proved I ſhould have allowed it an argument, as it is true that God alone is the fountain whence grace and mercy can flow, and from which alone the apoſtles, with the ſpirit of truth, could ſeek to draw them: but ſurely if the names of other Beings be found joined with that of God in the performance of actions, of which other Beings are capable, it can never be admitted an argument againſt the divinity of Chriſt, whoſe name is often found joined with God, and invoked to perform actions of which God alone is capable. To Timothy St. Paul ſays, "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect angels," 1 Tim. v. 21; and on this paſſage Mr. Lindſey

* Gen. vi. 8. † Rev. v. 6.

ſey makes the ſame obſervation as that above, ſaying, "the angels being here joined with God and Chriſt, ſhews that when God is joined with other Beings in the moſt ſolemn manner, no equality can be inferred from ſuch a conjunction;" Apology, p. 107. Now I deny that God is in this inſtance joined with other Beings in the moſt ſolemn manner, the conferring of a charge upon Timothy was an act of which every Being, upon whom God had beſtowed the powers of diſcernment, was a proper and competent witneſs before whom he ſhould confer it, and therefore, had the apoſtle joined man and every intelligent nature to the name of God, and of Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect angels, it could not in the leaſt derogate from the dignity of God, or ever be interpreted as conferring upon them a claim to Godhead. That it ſhould argue againſt Chriſt's divinity, it is neceſſary to ſhew that it proves too much, and therefore nothing, and that too-much, which it is ſuppoſed to prove, is, that the angels are God alſo; but does any ſuch conſequence follow? Certainly not; and therefore this moſt ſolemn conjunction cannot impeach the divinity of our Lord. I do not deſire the aid of this verſe in proof of our Saviour's Godhead, there being no greater power called into exerciſe than that of witneſſing a charge to which the witneſs of God will add ſolemnity indeed, but which is an act that he has given power to inferior natures to perform. "Ye are my witneſſes, and God alſo," 1 Theſſ. ii. 10, ſays St. Paul: now which does this moſt ſolemn conjunction of God and the Theſſalonians prove, the Theſſalonians to be God, or God a Theſſalonian? Neither one nor the other; for the conduct of Paul, which he called upon God and them to teſtify to be juſt and holy, was performed equally before God and them, and they being endowed with adequate faculties, were therefore equally competent witneſſes of it. But with reſpect to the

the paſſage before us, the apoſtle, about to ſend forth a preacher of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, and recommending perſeverance and conſtancy in "the teſtimony of our Lord," has, with peculiar accuracy, ſelected the witneſſes to his charge to Timothy, remembering that Jeſus Chriſt, coming to judgement, is to be attended by the holy angels, who are therefore on that day, when all fleſh ſhall be aſſembled before God, to be witneſſes to the manifeſtation of all the hidden things, and the counſels of all hearts: before them therefore Paul has judiciouſly choſen to give his charge, as in their preſence Timothy well knew he ſhould in the end render an account of his apoſtleſhip, and, according to the diſcharge of his holy function, "have praiſe of God," or "be made a ſpectacle to angels," 1 Cor. iv. 9; for Jeſus Chriſt has himſelf ſaid, "whoſoever ſhall confeſs me before men, him ſhall the Son of man alſo confeſs before the angels of God," Luke xii. 8. &c.

I have now brought to an end, not indeed the whole of the evidence of our Saviour's divinity afforded by the ſcriptures, but the whole of that which I intend to produce; for, "if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe that even the world could not contain the books that ſhould be written." Somewhere however I muſt pauſe, and therefore conſider myſelf as well warranted to do ſo now, as I ſhould be after a much more voluminous work: for, to my apprehenſion, I have already exhibited proof amply ſufficient to eſtabliſh my point, and therefore ſincerely hope for the concurrence of my intelligent, and not "unlearned reader," in this concluſion from the whole, namely, that our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt is with the Father the one "firſt and laſt, which was dead and is alive

alive for evermore, the Almighty, beſides whom there is no God," If. xliv. 6. Rev. i. 8, and ii. 8.

I by no means conſider every one of the ſcriptural proofs which I have made uſe of, as equally able to ſuſtain the argument by itſelf; for ſome among them may be of diſputable interpretation, but at the ſame time, being united with ſuch as are incontrovertible, (for many ſuch I am bold to declare there are) they borrow light from them, and ſtrength to ſupport their part of the burden: but let me carry this idea to the utmoſt, and ſuppoſe every aſſertion that Chriſt is God, which I have brought from ſcripture, confuted and ſhewed to be miſapplied, one only excepted, that one to which no anſwer can be given muſt remain as compleat a proof of our Saviour's divinity as ten thouſand repetitions of it could afford; for all ſcriptures being written by inſpiration, there is no aſſertion for the truth of which God himſelf is not reſponſible, and that which God has once ſaid requires no farther confirmation: but if it be found that he has once declared the Godhead of Jeſus Chriſt, that fact is immutably eſtabliſhed; and being eſtabliſhed, may well be allowed a matter of ſufficient importance to be frequently referred to, nay, (though not neceſſarily for the confirmation of God's truth, yet for the more extenſive information of mankind) to be frequently repeated. If then many texts in ſcripture, upon inconteſtible proof of Chriſt's Godhead from any one, admit of an eaſy interpretation by referring them to that great truth, why ſhould we heſitate to interpret them by it, inſtead of wreſting them to ſenſes that they will not endure; Procruſtes-like, torturing them down to the diminutive bulk of our own imaginations; and thereby rendering the word of God, which alone is true and wiſe, inexplicable and inconſiſtent with itſelf?

It is only the facts which are revealed, and not the manner of relating the facts contained in ſcripture, that are ſaid to be to the Greeks fooliſhneſs; were the relation inconſiſtent with itſelf, it would be juſtly chargeable with folly before God himſelf, who cannot lye. That folly which St. Paul apprehends the Greeks will lay to the charge of his goſpel, is, that it did not coincide with their doctrines. Inconſiſtency with itſelf is inconſiſtency with God, who ſees things only as they really are, and conſequently not as they are not; whereas inconſiſtency with my opinion may be wiſdom, though to me fooliſhneſs; for I may have ſeen things as they are not, or not have ſeen them as they really are. What God relates cannot be but true; he cannot relate contradictions; our belief therefore is not required to contradictions. A God crucified in the fleſh, in which he had humbly taken the form of a ſervant, and ſubmitted to feel the infirmities of man, was, to the philoſophical religion of the Greeks, fooliſhneſs indeed; for, with it, it was altogether inconſiſtent; but it was nevertheleſs the wiſdom of God, and the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that believeth. To the Jews, who had long known the one true God, and who had experienced proſperity or adverſity as his mighty arm was ſtretched out to lead or to chaſtiſe them, the bleeding body of our Lord ſuffering death under their own hands, was indeed a ſtumbling-block; for it was altogether inconſiſtent with their idea of the Almighty Jehovah. A plurality of perſons in the God who had declared his name to be "one," was to the Jews an unſurmountable difficulty; it tranſcended their faculties, and, as they conceived themſelves in poſſeſſion of a full acquaintance with the incomprehenſible nature of their Maker, it was altogether inconſiſtent with their vain preſumptions. To the Jew and to the Unitarian it is alike a ſtumbling-block, "For unqueſtionably the Trinity is

one of thoſe doctrines that prejudice them moſt againſt chriſtianity," Apology, p. 88.

If it be aſked, as indeed it is, though not in direct terms, why a fact of ſuch great importance to us to believe is not laid down in ſo many words, by the witneſſes of our Lord, in any of their epiſtles? it is not difficult to give an anſwer to ſuch as will conſider, that the epiſtles were written to men already in poſſeſſion of it; not with a view of introducing them to a new object of faith, but of eſtabliſhing them in a faith already imparted; for, not to inſiſt upon the circumſtance of Paul's having viſited all thoſe people to whom he afterwards addreſſed his epiſtles, the Romans and the Coloſſians excepted; nor to weary my leſs active reader by taking him in purſuit of this vigilant apoſtle through all the dangers that he encountered for the ſake of propagating "the goſpel of God our Saviour" in every region; I can prove, from internal evidence, that he only wrote to thoſe who had already obtained grace to be faithful, and who therefore needed not that he ſhould now inſtruct them in the object of their faith. From Corinth, where he had firſt known and taught Aquila and Priſcilla, he wrote to the Romans; and when he wrote his epiſtle to them, Aquila and Priſcilla were at Rome, for he ſalutes them there. To theſe fellow labourers of Paul, Apollos was indebted for his knowledge of the goſpel: it is therefore highly probable that ſo faithful and diligent preachers of the word had not been inactive in bearing the teſtimony of our Lord to the Romans alſo; for Paul directs his letter to them in the following terms: "To all that be at Rome, beloved of God, called to be ſaints, and whoſe faith is ſpoken of throughout the whole world," Rom, i. 7, 8. If ſuch was their faith already, to what end ſhould the object of it be pointed out anew; but perſeverance and

conſtancy were indeed properly to be recommended, and a ſtedfaſt adherence to that which they had known. He had already planted; his object now was to water only; to cultivate and aſſiſt the growth of the infant goſpel; to cauſe it to extend its boughs; to gather the faithful under its peaceful ſhade; and to point out to their obſervation the bleſſed fruit with which the branches of this tree of life were laden, ſaying, in the day that thou eateſt hereof thou ſhalt ſurely LIVE. To the Corinthians he wrote from Philippi, and addreſſes himſelf "to them that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus, called to be ſaints with all that in every place call upon the name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, both theirs and ours," 1 Cor. i. 2. Is not this a direct acknowledgment that they were already well informed, and needed not now to be told that he, on whoſe name they called, the object of their religious worſhip, even Jeſus Chriſt, their Lord and ours, was one with the Father, God? This he had taught them before when he was preſent, and had baptized Criſpus and Gaius among them; and to what end ſhould he now renew the ſuperfluous information? The Galatians he chides, not indeed for having relinquiſhed the goſpel which he had before preached to them, but for having liſtened to ſome who had endeavoured to introduce the ceremonies of the law into the practice of chriſtianity. To theſe therefore he is more explicit, as they were perverted, and that it was neceſſary to bring them back; and though he does not, in direct terms, declare the Godhead of our Saviour, he uſes words very nearly ſynonimous, words fully ſufficient to recall former knowledge, and revive the memory of what he had before communicated; for he ſays, that "he was not taught the goſpel of Chriſt by man, but by the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt; that he had himſelf once been as zealous of the law, as they could now be, but that, notwithſtanding he

he had, through Zeal for the traditions of the Jews, perſecuted the church of God: being now called to be a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, he ſaw and preached that juſtification came by faith in Chriſt, and not by ſuch works as are enjoined by the fleſhly ordinances of the law," Gal. i. In his epiſtle to the Epheſians, to whom he wrote from Rome, after he had been tranſmitted thither by Feſtus, and ſome years after his laſt viſit to them, he ſays, "I ceaſe not to give thanks for you, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jeſus," Eph i. For the faith of the Philippians alſo he thanks God, and directs his epiſtle "to all the ſaints in Chriſt Jeſus, which are at Philippi," Philip. i. To them and to the Coloſſians he wrote while a priſoner at Rome, and to theſe latter he addreſſes himſelf "to the ſaints and faithful brethren in Chriſt, which are at Coloſſe," "we give thanks to God ſince we heard of your faith in Chriſt Jeſus," Coloſ. i. *At Theſſalonica Paul was ſeverely treated by the unbelieving Jews, who, after his departure, not only purſued him to Berea, but continued to perſecute the few of their own countrymen who had believed, and "conſorted with Paul and Silas:" to this little "church of the Theſſalonians, which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt;" it is that St. Paul writes, "remembering without ceaſing their work of faith, as they had become followers of the Lord, having received the word with much affliction, wherefore they were enſamples to all that believe," 1 Theſſ. i. 1. Now the word of God which Paul had preached at Theſſalonica, and for which he was driven out, was charged againſt him by his perſecutors, to have been his "ſaying, contrary to the decree of Cæſar, that there is another *King*, one Jeſus;" ſo that we find, that, though to a faithful people, he did not think it neceſſary to tell what was the object of their faith, which it is probable Paul was of opinion they

knew themſelves; he nevertheleſs on his firſt viſit let them into an acquaintance with the one meaning of the words *God* and *Chriſt*, and that Jeſus Chriſt is with the Father, the one God, the Lord of hoſts, the *King* of glory. Timothy and Titus he calls "his own ſons after the faith;" and we well know that they had accompanied, and aſſiſted him in diffuſing the light of the goſpel; his epiſtles to them contain a charge to "bear the teſtimony of our Lord," and a rule for their demeanor as men appointed to ſo great a truſt. His letter to Philemon, "his dearly beloved fellow labourer," ſeems little more than of a private nature. The object of this "Jew of Tarſus," in writing to his own countrymen the Hebrews, is to remove their adherence to the law of Moſes, which was the grand obſtruction to their belief, and to ſhew that it was not, as they conceived, altogether profitable, and therefore not immutably permanent, but that it might be done away; and this even according to their own prophets, to which he therefore refers them. It is not my purpoſe here to paraphraſe the epiſtles of this great preacher of Jeſus Chriſt; it anſwers my end to ſhew that there is a ſufficient reaſon for his not having ſummed the doctrine, which he conveys in them, into the one ſhort propoſition, that "Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God." It ſeems to be the intention of "James, a ſervant of God, and of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt," to comment on the epiſtles of St. Paul, and to ſtand up againſt the miſrepreſentations of the unlearned and unſtable, who wreſted ſuch things as were hard to be underſtood in them to their own deſtruction. He did not undertake to point out an object of faith, but to ſhew "with what reſpect we ſhould have the faith of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Lord of glory;" he preſuppoſes the faith of his hearers, and is grafting the morality of a Chriſtian upon it; he oppoſes himſelf to

ſome-

ſomething very like modern methodiſm, built upon an erroneous acceptation of St. Paul's doctrine of juſtification by faith alone; ſhews that the works which that apoſtle precludes are the ceremonies of the law, as inconſiſtent with the liberty of the goſpel, but that, by works of "pure and undefiled religion, ſpotleſs and benevolent *before God*, the faith in our bleſſed Redeemer is made perfect," he preſcribes, not what faith we ſhould entertain, but how we ſhould entertain that of which we were before poſſeſſed. Peter writes to the "elect, who, not having ſeen Chriſt, yet love him; who believe, and therefore rejoice with unſpeakable joy full of glory;" and this "ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt" addreſſes his ſecond epiſtle "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteouſneſs of our God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," 2 Pet i. 1. For ſo it ſtands (not in the French perhaps, but) in the Greek, as the margin of our Bible alſo acknowledges. St. John writes his firſt epiſtle, "not becauſe ye know not the truth, but becauſe ye know it," 1 John ii. 21; and then proceeds to eſtabliſh his hearers againſt thoſe who ſeduce them, by doctrines which hardly differ from the direct propoſition; but of which I have already taken notice. He rejoices greatly that the "elect lady," to whom he directs his ſecond epiſtle, and Gaius, to whom he addreſſes his third, "walk in the truth." "St. Jude, the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt," writes "to them that are ſanctified by God the Father, and preſerved in Jeſus Chriſt, and called," and declares the ſufficiency of once delivering the faith. To what end now ſhould any one of the apoſtles, in direct terms impart the divinity of our bleſſed Lord, when every perſon, to whom they wrote, was already apprized of the fact? But it may be ſaid that they wrote for the information of poſterity, as well as of thoſe to whom they more im-

immediately addreſſed themſelves, and that therefore they ſhould have done it. And have they not ſufficiently done it? have they not ſufficiently revealed it to ſuch as will, in obedience to the precept of our Lord himſelf, "ſearch the ſcriptures"? When I hear that there is but one God; when I hear our Saviour, in the vail of the fleſh, ſay, "Father, if it be poſſible let this cup paſs away from me;" and when knowing that Jeſus Chriſt died for our redemption, I hereby "perceive the love of God, becauſe he laid down his life for us," 1 John iii. 16: what need have I of a farther explanation to enable me to form the propoſition myſelf, and ſay that as the Father is God, and as the Son is God, and yet as there is but one God, the Son, even our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is therefore one with the Father, that one God. But it may ſtill be objected, that we ſee the apoſtles frequently, on their firſt appearance among the different people to whom they preached, and that therefore we might expect to hear the fact related expreſsly in their Acts; and do we not? has not Paul charged the Epheſian elders at Miletus "to feed the church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own blood?" Acts xx. 28. Was not every preſcript made by the apoſtles, made to all that would hear the word? and were not the doctrines delivered by them to any one church, written for the profit of all? and was not that which was delivered to all of that generation, written in one code, and tranſmitted through time for our uſe and information? That code is the Bible; and from the whole of the Bible, this one propoſition is to be deduced; the whole Bible therefore, and nothing leſs than the whole, is to be pronounced the goſpel or teſtimony of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and thence it is, that this propoſition is as deducible as any concluſion reſulting from any premiſes, even in the mathematical

tical Elements of Euclid, namely, that Jesus Christ is one with the Father, God.

I shall, for the future, consider my point as proved, and therefore admitted, and henceforward address myself more directly to Mr. Lindsey's book, and weigh the objections which he has made to our Saviour's Divinity; and as I have but little doubt that I shall be able to shew these wanting in the balance, I shall dismiss them with what expedition I possibly can. He tells us that there were very early heresies in the church; and in the next passage says, that "all *Christian people for upwards of three hundred years after Christ, till the council of Nice, were* generally *Unitarians* *." I do not mean to enter the lists with this gentleman on the ground of ecclesiastical history in general; but in this point I will dare to meet him, and I will not use "the authorities of men, which are nothing. It is holy scripture alone which can decide this important point, and to that we must make our final appeal †." To that I do appeal; and thence I learn, and think that even I have thence rendered it evident, that not one of the apostles of our Lord was an Unitarian. The first of these three centuries then I must use the liberty of taking away from Mr. Lindsey's bold and unsupported assertion; for to the close of it was the life of the beloved disciple of Jesus Christ extended; and therefore *all* Christian men were not Unitarians: but perhaps the less extensive word "*generally*" came into the latter end of the sentence as a saving term, and with intention to subtract from "*all*" in the commencement of it, and so to leave St. John the remainder; a single instance of a retrograde character, who, notwithstanding the weight of general example, very ob-

 stinately

* Apology, p. 24. † Apology, p. 23.

ſtinately perſiſted in the belief of the ſpirit of truth, from whom he had learned a contrary doctrine. Holy ſcripture is ſilent with reſpect to the two ſucceeding centuries; I ſhall therefore here decline the combat, and ſuppoſe the fact to be as this gentleman has ſtated it, and, on that ſuppoſition, refer to what he has himſelf ſaid, that, "at the firſt planting of the goſpel a crop of evil weeds, and wild opinions grew up, together with the plant of heavenly *truth*," Apology, p. 20 *.

"Diſbelief of the Trinity, no blameable hereſy," is the marginal title of a ſhort ſection of Mr. Lindſey's Apology. I ſhall not enlarge on the merit or demerit of belief in the doctrines of Chriſtianity, but muſt ſay, that I look upon a diſbelief in the Trinity to be the ſame with a diſbelief in Jeſus Chriſt, as revealed to us in the holy ſcriptures.

I ſhould be ſorry that any reader of my book ſhould impute a ſpirit of intolerance to me, becauſe I altogether reject the teſtimony of fire and faggot, undergone by ſome Unitarians in maintenance of their tenets. I have at leaſt equal compaſſion for their ſufferings, with that which Mr. Lindſey can feel; but as I cannot infer the truth of their profeſſion from their miſeries, ſo neither can I admit the cruelty which inflicted them to be any argument of the falſehood of the religion embraced, or rather profeſſed by their barbarous tormentors; for, if this be inſiſted on to be of weight againſt the profeſſion of faith in the Trinity, "the tranſitory triumphs of the Arians," notwithſtanding the brevity of their proſperous

* I ſhould here aſk Mr. Lindſey's pardon for the abridgment of his beautiful metaphor, in which he has ſowed *light* upon a buſy mind, and, inſtead of reaping a fine crop of young luminaries, has, on account of the rankneſs of the ſoil, only been able to gather in evil weeds and wild opinions of baleful *ſhade*.

rous days, can furniſh me with means to make the oppoſite ſcale greatly preponderate. Were recrimination my object, or were I to admit but for a moment, that ſufferings are of any value in evidence, good God! how many witneſſes might I call to prove the truth of the doctrines which I maintain! But why ſhould I call? from whom ſhall I receive my anſwer? They are for ever ſilent who ſhould have rendered it; the poor dumb mouths, which once eloquently poured forth the doctrines of our Redeemer, now tongueleſs, can only pour forth that blood which they have ſhed to teſtify their belief in him. Yet even here I ſeek not a teſtimony of the truth of my own tenets, nor of the falſehood of theirs, who, to ſhun the confutation, put thoſe to ſilence who could have uttered it. But as I have treated of this mode of argument before, I ſhall now finally diſmiſs it, with an aſſurance to Mr. Lindſey, that I do, as warmly as he can, compaſſionate all men who have ſuffered for their ſincerity, and as utterly abhor the execrable zeal of their infatuated perſecutors as he can poſſibly do.

The immutable nature of truth can never be affected, ſhe remains equally ſpotleſs, whether ſhe be aſſailed by an ingenious opponent, or an abſurd advocate. The ingenuity of ſophiſm is in like manner unable to alter the nature of falſehood, neither can ſhe borrow ſtrength from the weakneſs of her adverſary. To this ſhort poſition I refer that great body of human authority cited by Mr. Lindſey, and to which, however able the men who compoſe it may be, I cannot pay any reſpect while they ſtand oppoſed to the word of God. To this head I alſo refer ſuch abſurdities as that uttered by Anſelm, Archbiſhop of Canterbury; the truth remained unchanged, even tho' he abetted it with violence. I do not deſire to have it conſidered that every

man who believes with me is therefore wise, and can give a reason for the faith that is in him. If I be found a defective advocate myself, let not my deficiency be transferred to my cause.

Mr. Lindsey says, "Authorities of men are nothing: it is holy scripture alone which can decide this important point, and to that we must make our final appeal," Apology, p. 23. After this assertion one might expect a candid enquiry into what the apostles have said upon this important point. But here we are severely disappointed, and scarce find a text quoted throughout his book but at second hand; nay, scarce a page of original writing through the whole work. Holy scripture is not once appealed to; and this same Nothing, the authorities of men, is the foundation of his system; and such as the foundation is, such indeed is the superstructure. But all this is very soon accounted for, and a perfectly new mode of argument is most ingeniously devised and introduced; and in the very next sentence to that in which he makes the scripture the final appeal, he proposes that "the matter is to be put to the vote, as it were." Now, though he never appeals to his final appeal, he does not in the same manner desert his own darling invention; but has instant recourse to as very an electioneering trick as ever was played at Brentford or Shoreham; for he flatly assures "the less learned" reader, that, upon enquiry, he shall find that to be undeniably true, which I have already shewed to be undeniably false; namely, that "all christian people for upwards of three hundred years after Christ, till the council of Nice, were generally Unitarians." This is a method of procuring votes with a witness; the whole interest of "the less learned" is obtained at one bold stroke; and in another passage of his book he has solicited the suffrages of the absolutely "unlearned;" and having

having thus obtained the ear of the populace, he trumpets forth a multitude of names of men, and ſacrifices every conſideration of the authority of ſcripture to the eſtabliſhment of their authority with the unlearned reader. To ſome of theſe I will allow that he may have done but juſtice, and I will not diſturb the aſhes of thoſe on whom he has poured unmerited incenſe. I fear not his hoſt of Unitarians, ſo long as I am abetted by the word of God, againſt which he has arrayed them. But in his diligent canvaſs I am ſurprized that he ſhould think of the names of the Voltaires, the Morgans, and the St. Johns: does he mean to poll theſe men too? Are theſe the apoſtles of the goſpel to which Mr. Lindſey appeals? But errour cannot, forſooth, eſcape their quick-ſighted eyes; I ſincerely believe it; they are active in purſuing and embracing errour, and I ſhall therefore allow them well qualified to vote with him on this occaſion. But when did their quick-ſighted eyes diſcover or purſue truth? In a few pages after we are aſtoniſhed at ſeeing David Hume advance to give his ſuffrage in the conteſt; his vote, however, I muſt admit to be unexceptionable; he is excellently qualified to abet Mr. Lindſey's tenets, having undertaken to ſubvert the religion and liberties of this country. Whenever the bonds of religion are looſed, and the reſtrictions of conſcience taken away, a ſubſtitute muſt be found to controul mankind, and an earthly tyrant be eſtabliſhed on the throne of a depoſed God, to bind in fetters thoſe hands which have rejected the eaſy yoke of their Creator, and emancipated themſelves from obedience to the mild ſway of their merciful Redeemer. Thus far the cunning, for I cannot call it the manly underſtanding, of Mr. Hume, has been able to penetrate; and accordingly, when with talents exactly adequate to miſchief, propenſities to put them into exerciſe, and a diſpoſition to enjoy the perpetrated

petrated crime, he has, by ſhallow ſophiſtry, ſeduced mankind into the paths of vice; he ruſhes on the villain he has made, and, like Jonathan Wild, conſigns to chains the wretch who has deſerved them from his own perſuaſion. When, as an eſſayeſt, with juſt enough of art to withhold a fraud from the eyes of an indolent or willing reader, he has obliterated every virtue by which we can deſerve or enjoy freedom, and has rendered the heart of an Engliſhman no ſtrenuous foe to deſpotiſm, he becomes the voluminous pamphleteer of the Stuarts, and, with juſt enough of plauſibility to conceal a falſehood from one who has no longer an intereſt in detecting it, to the conſenting ſlave points out the acceptable tyrant, and to the tyrant the hands which he has fitted to his chains *.

Mr.

* I may ſeem here to have ſtepped out of my way unneceſſarily; I cannot, however, admit that I have. The peace and tranquillity of mankind are my object, and to the maintenance of them it is neceſſary that I ſhould ſtrike at their enemies as they croſs me, and put my fellow creatures on their guard againſt the invader of their happineſs; ſuch I conſider Mr. Hume to be, and accordingly point him out as a Being that has waged eternal war with the welfare of mankind, both here and hereafter; who has untied, or, rather like a rat, nibbled at, the bonds of religious duty, that a neceſſity might thence ariſe of impoſing the manacles of civil ſlavery; who frees us from our God that he may enthral us to man; inflicts the heavieſt ills upon us in this life, and with a mercileſs hand tears away that hope of a future recompenſe, which was the only conſolation that remained to the wretch he had enſlaved.—Let it not be ſaid that, in what he has done to theſe ends, he is himſelf alſo deceived. No man can ignorantly falſify in the relation of important hiſtorical facts; he therefore who has ſo falſified muſt have done it knowingly, and he who is capable of impoſing known falſehood upon the public ear, is capable of broaching known ſophiſms: but this man has by falſehood ſtruck at our liberties, and, by premeditated ſophiſtry, at our religion. The neceſſity of their aid to the promotion of his deſign, is no mean proof of our right to enjoy the invaluable bleſſings of freedom and hope, and argues them to ſtand upon the firm baſis of truth; and ſurely that he has had recourſe to them for ſuch a purpoſe as that of ſubverting all human felicity, is a ſufficient reaſon for us to deſpiſe the wretch whoſe treachery and malice prepenſe has aimed a blow againſt our religious and civil rights.—When I have juſt repeated that I look upon our liberty to be ſo intimately connected with our virtue, and our virtue with the religion of the goſpel, that, on the

over-

Mr. Whiſton may give his voice for Mr. Lindſey; he preferred the *apoſtolical* conſtitutions to the canonical books of the New Teſtament, declared them more ſacred and quite divine, becauſe they favoured his Arian ſentiments *. This book was written in the fourth century; and, as it teaches a doctrine not found in the ſcriptures, has, from this *apoſtolic* old man, obtained a preference. But I ſhall ceaſe to purſue this idea farther; for, however deſerving of ridicule Mr. Lindſey's argument may be, the ſubject calls on me to be ſerious.

Mr. Lindſey dwells upon the prejudices of mankind taken in with their nurſes milk, upon doctrines darkened and perplexed by early prepoſſeſſions. It is true, and I thank God and my pious parents for it, that, with my nurſe's milk, I did imbibe the doctrine which I now maintain; and at the ſame time I embibed a belief, that graſs was green, that fire was hot, that ſnow was cold, and that two and two make four. With ſuch various errours was my infancy turned aſide from truth, and ſo radically have they been eſtabliſhed in my mind by education, that I have never ſince that fatal time, when my inſtructors cruelly took advantage of my ſuſceptible and tender years, been able to comprehend that clear evidence which is of force to ſet aſide ſuch abſurdities. This childiſh and commonplace objection to the truth, becauſe it was early known, does not deſerve a ſerious refutation. If the ſcriptures afford a ſufficient teſtimony now, is it an argument to the contrary of that which they teſtify, that our teachers have read and aſſented to them, and that they have thought the word of God fit to be com-

overthrow of the latter, one undiſtinguiſhed ruin muſt overwhelm them all together, my indignation will probably meet not the pardon only, but the approbation of *ſome* of my countrymen.

* Apology, p. 68.

communicated to their children? But I will now put a queſtion to Mr. Lindſey, to which, if he does not find the anſwer on the ſurface of his heart, let him ſearch the inmoſt receſſes of it, and thence inform me, whether even his diſintereſted conduct, whether the doctrine of Unitarianiſm, of which he is the ſtrenuous advocate, are purſued by him without one prejudice? I do not ſpeak of thoſe which are inſtilled by education, but others which, perhaps, he has not found ſo conquerable. This, however, is a delicate point, and muſt not be purſued farther. I mean not to wound nor diminiſh the public regard of this worthy gentleman, but chooſing to put my rule by an inſtance, rather than in a general way, have fixed upon his name, as affording me an argument *à fortiori* in its behalf.

Such objections as turn meerly upon words I ſhall leave unanſwered, they merit contempt and not conſideration; but I muſt ſhow that, upon ſuch a ſuppoſition as the exiſtence of the Trinity, that chain of abſurdities and contradictions, which Mr. Lindſey thinks would follow, are by no means the natural conſequence of the doctrine: there may be much that Mr. Lindſey cannot look into, I grant it; but did God take council of Mr. Lindſey; or has he revealed himſelf to him as he did to the apoſtles and prophets? Biſhop Pearſon's words keep the firſt and ſecond perſons in the Trinity diſtinct; the Father and the Son are not ſaid in the ſcriptures to be jointly one Father, or one Son, but they are declared to be one God. And as to the aſſertion, that we who join in the four invocations, at the beginning of the litany, can be but ill defended againſt the charge of holding four Gods, to wit, the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghoſt, and the Trinity, (declared by him to be a fourth intelligent agent); it is about as wiſely put as if we ſhould

ſay,

ſay, that the government of Rome was adminiſtered, not by three, but by four men, to wit, Octavius, Lepidus, Anthony, and the Triumvirate, "which is the utmoſt confuſion imaginable." Apology, p. 124.

To the conſequences of offering up divine honour to Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, which are brought together in the 136th page of the Apology, I oppoſe all that I have already brought in proof of the one Godhead of the Father and the Son; for this one poſition being admitted, our Saviour has directed prayer to be made to himſelf.—There is authority for ſo doing in the writings of the apoſtles.—The object of our worſhip is not inferior to the Father, with whom he is one God;—and therefore there never can be a diſtraction in the mind of the ſober worſhipper, who, holding in ſafe memory the unity of the Godhead of the Father, and of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, will never entertain "a doubt, when he is to pray to God, and when to Chriſt, when it is right, and when amiſs to do it;" he will always find one God the object of his adoration, who, remembering his mercies vouchſafed to man in the fleſh, will hear the prayer preferred to him, with gratitude and reliance upon him, who has already ſo graciouſly redeemed him by laying down his own life for him, 1 John iii. 16.

Mr. Lindſey, having allowed that it is Jeſus Chriſt who is to judge the world, by diſallowing his Godhead, and conſequently the direction of prayer to him, has actually conferred upon God the Father, the office of Mediator with Jeſus Chriſt, who is to judge us: for if the Godhead be not in Chriſt, our merits, of which no creature can have cognizance, are to be handed over for his information; and God the Father, to whom alone they can be known, is to ſtand forth before the

ſeat of judgement, as our accuſer or excuſer: ſo that here we find a change of office between the Father and the Son; an abſurdity at leaſt as great as any that appears to Mr. Lindſey's reaſon, on the eſtabliſhment of my tenets; an abſurdity, in which no man can acquieſce, becauſe it contradicts the principles whence our argument proceeds, and directly oppoſes itſelf to revelation: whereas the difficulties ariſing from an acquieſcence in the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, are only in matters not ſubmitted to reaſon, and upon which we never ſhould pronounce that the facts are not ſo, becauſe we do not ſee how they are ſo with faculties not equal to the intuition.

The argumentum ad abſurdum to which Mr. Lindſey's authors have frequent recourſe, is to be judged of according to the nature of the abſurdity which it would point out, as a conſequence of admitting the fact it is oppoſed to; and if that be only ſuch, or ſaid to be ſuch, becauſe our reaſon cannot ſolve it from its incomprehenſibility, it affords no confutation of the poſition it tries to confute: whereas, if the abſurdity reſult from inconſiſtency with revelation, which muſt fall upon its eſtabliſhment, it is a good argument; nothing being to be admitted which can militate againſt the truth of God. This general rule, (a rule ſo obvious, that nothing but having ſeen a book written without any regard to it, could have induced me to ſet it down) the reader of Mr. Lindſey's Apology will do well to hold conſtantly in mind, for by referring what he reads there to it, there is very little contained in the book to which it does not afford a compleat anſwer.

Having believed the ſcriptures to be the revelation of God, I have ever avoided the gloſſes of commentators, influenced by intereſt or prejudice, and have made the unperverted

unperverted original my ſtudy, in order thence to derive a religion for myſelf, and I muſt acknowledge that I have often conceived, both from St. John's firſt epiſtle, and from ſeveral paſſages in the epiſtles of St. Paul, that they particularly oppoſed themſelves to an opinion, prevalent in their day, that Jeſus Chriſt had not come in the fleſh; that he had not like infirmities and temptations as we have, but that the ſenſes of mankind were impoſed upon by the appearance of a body only. But as I have ſaid that the truth moſt difficult to be conceived by mankind is, not that God had deſcended to dwell on earth, or that a man Jeſus had lived on earth; but that an union of the two natures of God and of man had ſubſiſted in Jeſus Chriſt, a man living among them, I inferred the following concluſion, "that the apoſtles had preached him as God only, leaving it to their own knowledge of him, to prove that he was man; that having ſeen the power with which the teſtimony of the apoſtles was attended, the hearers yielded credit to that which they witneſſed, and forthwith acknowledged Jeſus Chriſt to be God: but that not being able to underſtand the compatibility of divine perfection and human imperfection, and therefore concluding that ſuch an union could not have ſubſiſted, they conſidered their ſenſes impoſed upon by an apparent body only, and rejected their belief in the manhood of Chriſt, not believing him to be man, whom they had acknowledged to be God; and that the apoſtles, on ſeeing ſuch a doctrine ariſe, found themſelves now under a neceſſity of preaching him as man, whom they had already taught to be God, and obliged to make uſe of the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, to re-eſtabliſh a fact which they had at firſt left to the teſtimony of the ſenſes; a teſtimony which they had conſidered as ſufficient then, but now ſaw ſuperſeded by that of their preaching." Mr. Lindſey has proved that I was not miſtaken in this;

and his account of these erroneous tenets is very correspondent to the idea which I had formed of them from scripture: for, of those who entertained them, he says, "They could not allow that a pure emanation of deity, such as they presumed Christ to be, could have any connection with so impure a substance as a human material body; and so they invented this solution of the difficulty, that he was a man in appearance only, and not in reality." Apology, p. 154. I cannot, for my part, exceedingly wonder at the errour into which these hearers fell; for I frankly acknowledge, that had I been a witness of the birth, life, death, burial, resurrection, and reascension of Jesus Christ into heaven; and had I afterwards heard him, by the assisted preaching of the apostles, declared to be God; the reality of that body, in which I had seen him, and in which I had seen him act such a part, would have come into suspicion with me; I should have doubted of the reality of a body so differently endowed from the bodies of all other men: "metuissem credere in carne natum, ne credere coactus fuissem ex carne inquinatum," St. Austin, quoted by Mr. Lindsey, Apology, p. 158, and I should have believed that he was all God without manhood. But I sincerely return thanks to the divine spirit that has testified of the flesh of our blessed atonement, and redeemed me from an errour whereby my spirit would have been proved not to have been of God. I care not to what Genus this Linnæus of divinity, who has so skilfully classed the opinions of mankind, will refer me; let him only remember that I do not now embrace such errours; for that philosophy, by which I should have said that he who is God, is therefore not man, is superseded; and I yield my faith obedient to his word, whose word alone is true; and, by consequence, I believe that Jesus Christ is come "a man

as

as concerning the flesh," and that he is also "over all, God blessed for ever."

The truth as set forth in the scriptures, I have all along acknowledged my reason incapable to comprehend; but Mr. Lindsey thinks it ought to be comprehensible, and will not allow that God had a right to retain a power greater than he has given us abilities to search into; or wisdom, the exercise of which he has not endowed us with a capacity to understand; and therefore he thinks we had better reject all that surpasses our faculties; for, by so doing, he is of opinion that we should have a perfect union in the church. Let us for a moment grant that we should obtain this union; what is it? An union in errour; and is such an union to be desired? is this the object of his wishes? does he look upon a concurrence in falsehood as a compensation for rejected truth? But the ruin of truth, he says, and quotes Dr. Clayton for it, is not likely to result; for the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Christian religion. That they never will is my sincere belief, and therefore it is my sincere belief, that Mr. Lindsey's proposed union in errour will never take place; for, is the rejection of a point, on which nothing less than the essence of Christianity depends, is the denial of his divinity, whom we worship, no subversion of his religion? I think that the object of my worship, and of my religion is one; and if my worship be deprived of its object, I know not where to find that of my religion; and should, on seeing "the King of kings" degraded from the throne of his glory, the "God who purchased us with his own blood," torn from the supplication of his adorers, then say that the gates of hell had prevailed against his church; an event which I trust that, of his infinite mercy, and according to his immutable

mutable promiſe, he will avert. But I ſhall now reſume the conceſſion I made, for a while, and oppoſe Mr. Lindſey's aſſertion, that union would be the conſequence of a legal eſtabliſhment, or admiſſion of his tenets; for we of the church, as now eſtabliſhed, might, in that caſe, think fit to be diſſenters from his doctrines, as he diſſents now from ours. I know that, for my part, I ſhould oppoſe them to the utmoſt of my power. But the true meaning of his words is eaſily comprized in this ſhort but profound propoſition, That if all mankind will agree with Mr. Lindſey, Mr. Lindſey will not diſagree with all mankind: yet even this I muſt take the liberty to doubt.

It is a very weak aſſertion, that faith in the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt leads to the admiſſion of many objects of worſhip, and that the church of Rome has thence taken occaſion to adore the Virgin Mary, the apoſtles, and martyrs, and ſuch other perſons as her own favour has been pleaſed to rank among her ſaints: for as the ground of faith in Jeſus Chriſt, as God, is by no means pretended to be the ground for the adoration of any beſides him, it is not true that the ſaints are worſhipped, becauſe he is revealed to be God. Jeſus Chriſt is revealed to be God; the ſaints are not revealed to be God: does it therefore follow that the ſaints are to be worſhipped? Certainly not. But very particular care has been taken to guard againſt the adoration of the Virgin Mary, and the apoſtles, and to prevent their being conſidered as proper objects of worſhip, though ſhe was declared bleſſed among women, and they were highly favoured above men, having been entruſted with the teſtimony of Jeſus Chriſt, who alſo wrought many miracles by their hands in ſupport of their witneſs. It ſeems to have been with a view of preventing mankind from looking upon ſuch circumſtances as a ground of worſhip,

worſhip, that our Saviour has, in more paſſages than one, ſpoken with ſeeming diſreſpect (if I may dare to uſe the expreſſion of him who was without ſin) to his mother: "woman, what have I to do with thee?" John ii. 4. "Who is my mother?" Mark iii. 33. Peter, when Cornelius met him and fell down at his feet, and worſhipped him, "took him up, ſaying, ſtand up, I myſelf alſo am a man," Acts x. 25, 26. And Paul and Barnabas, when they heard that the prieſt of Jupiter, with the people at Lyſtra, would have done ſacrifice unto them, "rent their cloaths, and ran in among the people, crying out, and ſaying, Sirs, why do ye theſe things? We alſo are men of like paſſions with you; and yet with theſe ſayings ſcarce reſtrained they the people, that they had not done ſacrifice unto them," Acts xiv. 14, 15, 18. And even the angel, than whom man is made a little lower, declined the worſhip of St. John, ſaying, "I am thy fellow ſervant, and of thy brethren that have the teſtimony of Jeſus, worſhip God," Rev. xix. 10. From the exerciſe of miraculous power, from ſupernatural endowments, we find mankind eaſily perſuaded to conclude divinity, or at leaſt an adorable ſuperiority in thoſe who are ſo endowed. To guard againſt this facility of ſuperſtition, and to ſhew that from an abſolute revelation only we are to believe the divinity of any, the ſeveral texts which I have cited, ſeem to have been written. It is true a revelation that Jeſus Chriſt is God, one with the Father, conveys an idea different from that of Mr. Lindſey, that the Father only is God, and ſo may afford an analogy, by which, faith, in a multitude of perſons in the Godhead, might be facilitated, if revealed, but by no means a proof that there are more perſons than are revealed: let us ſtill remember the limits of reaſon, and not perpetually fly beyond her confines: ſhe will conduct us very ſafely, if we do

not

not obtrude premiſes upon her which are not within her diſtrict: with reſpect to ſcripture truths, the peremptory word of the God of truth, is the ultimate boundary of her province. Our terms of ſalvation are preſcribed, and God does not require our ingenuity in finding more points of faith than he has offered for our aſſent in order to ſecure it; and if he has not revealed, he does not need our belief, however like we may conclude our own ſuggeſtions to be to that which he has made known. Analogy may indeed facilitate conception, and make us more readily enter into a poſition laid down; yet it is but a bad ground to argue upon, for no certain concluſion can ever follow from it. I ſhall myſelf uſe it now to illuſtrate; and as I have denied that it can, from the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, ſhew the divinity of any other not revealed to be divine, I only aſk its aſſiſtance in procuring a more eaſy aſſent to the divinity of that which is revealed to be divine; and this will, I preſume, not be withheld by thoſe who have carried its uſe ſo much higher than I dare to do. If then the Holy Ghoſt be revealed to be one with the Father, and the Son, God, it may be ſome eaſe to the mind in giving its aſſent to the exiſtence of a third perſon in the Godhead, to reflect that it has already acquieſced in the admiſſion of a ſecond. It is not my intention to examine into the evidence of the divinity of the Holy Spirit ſo extenſively as I have already done into that which is afforded to the Godhead of our bleſſed Redeemer; it is not ſo ſtrenuouſly oppoſed; beſides my attentive reader has, in all probability, inferred it for himſelf, from ſeveral contexts which I have laid down already, though I have not directly pointed it out as a concluſion. I ſhall therefore now content myſelf with a very few paſſages proving the Holy Ghoſt to be God alſo, reminding my reader of what I have already offered

fered concerning the ſufficiency of any one aſſertion, for the truth of which God himſelf is reſponſible.

" He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the Higheſt." " The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee: therefore alſo that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God," Luke i. 31, 35. That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghoſt," Matth. i. 20. That which is conceived of the Holy Ghoſt, is therefore called the Son of God; the Holy Ghoſt therefore, of whom the Son of God is conceived, is one with the Father and the Son, " the Higheſt."

" I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth." " I will not leave you comfortleſs: I will come to you." " If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him," John xiv. 16, 17, 18, 23. Here the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, one God, are, or is, the Comforter, the witneſs to the truth, which ſhall come and abide, or make abode with him who loveth the Son, and keepeth his words. The identity of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit with that of the Father, and of the Son, is here expreſsly declared.

" Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghoſt?" " thou haſt not lied unto men but unto God," Acts v. 3, 4. Here alſo the Holy Ghoſt is directly pronounced to be one, with the Father and the Son, God.

" The things of God, knoweth no man but the Spirit of God;" " which things alſo we ſpeak, not in

the words which man's wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt teacheth," 1 Cor. ii. 11, 13. Here the Holy Ghoſt is one and the ſame with the Spirit of God; and in the 16th verſe he is called "the mind of Chriſt;" he is therefore one in Godhead with the Father and the Son, from both of whom, one God, he equally proceeds.

"What, know ye not that ye are the temple of the Holy Ghoſt which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price," 1 Cor. vi. 19. What now is the price paid for this purchaſe wherewith we are bought? are we not "the church of God which he hath purchaſed with his own blood?" Acts xx. 28. Being then redeemed by the blood of Jeſus Chriſt ſhed for our ranſom, we have therefore become the temple of the Holy Ghoſt. But "know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him ſhall God deſtroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are," 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. The Father is God, and the Son is "God, who purchaſed us with his own blood;" and the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe temple we are, is here declared to be God. But there is but one God; the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are therefore that one God, that Trinity in Unity which is to be worſhipped. This may ſeem to 'the natural man', Mr. Lindſey, to be *hay and ſtubble*; but let him lay aſide the vanity of thinking himſelf in the leaſt degree a judge of ſpiritual things, and believe that which God has witneſſed; "Let him become a fool, that he may be wiſe, for the wiſdom of this world is fooliſhneſs with God," 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19; "Let him account of the apoſtles as ſtewards of the myſteries of God," 1 Cor. iv. 1. "and not be taken as wiſe in his own craftineſs." "We are

the

the houſe of Chriſt, if we hold faſt the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end," Heb. iii. 6. "Know ye not your ownſelves that Jeſus Chriſt in you, except ye be reprobates?" 2 Cor. xiii. 5. "Ye are the temple of the Holy Ghoſt which is in you." "Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath ſaid, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people," 2 Cor, vi. 16. Is this to be reſiſted?

That it was God who ſpoke by the prophets, is not denied. But by the mouth of the prophet David God has ſaid, "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderneſs: when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and ſaw my work. Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and ſaid, it is a people that do err in their heart, and they have not known my ways. Unto whom I ſware in my wrath, that they ſhould not enter into my reſt," Pſ. xcv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Of him who has thus ſworn, and who was thus provoked for forty years in the wilderneſs, even that God who led the children of Iſrael out of the land of Egypt, and out of the houſe of bondage, and ſaid, "I am the Lord thy God," it is thus declared by St. Paul, "the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, to-day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, &c," Heb. iii. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

Our Saviour himſelf ſays, "The ſpirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtify of me," John xv. 26; and accordingly St. Paul having declared to the Hebrews, that they who had heard the Lord confirmed his great ſalvation unto us, "God alſo bearing them witneſs," Heb. ii. 3. proceeds to preach the ſufficiency of the one ſacrifice of Chriſt's body once offered for ſins, and the kingdom of heaven

opened to all believers by his having overcome the ſharpneſs of death, and "an entrance into the holieſt by the blood of Jeſus, by a new and living way which he hath conſecrated for us," "whereof the Holy Ghoſt is a witneſs to us," Heb. x. 15. "It is the Spirit that beareth witneſs, becauſe the ſpirit is truth." "If we receive the witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is greater: for this is the witneſs of God, which he hath teſtified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witneſs in himſelf: he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, becauſe he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son;" 1 John v. 9, 10. Theſe words amply explain the meaning of St. Paul's direction to the Theſſalonians, "Quench not the Spirit," 1 Theſſ. v. 19; and, upon the whole, we ſo frequently find the teſtimony of Jeſus Chriſt borne by God and by the Holy Ghoſt, that we muſt conclude the Holy Ghoſt, who "is a witneſs unto us," to be one with the Father and with the Son, God, who hath given the record of his Son, "that witneſs who is in him that believeth on the Son of God." This may perhaps afford more provender for Mr. Lindſey. I ſhould hope however that he may, by this time at leaſt, have begun to doubt the tenets which he has profeſſed, and reflect on the very deſtructive conſequences of his errour, if he can be perſuaded to conſider his doctrine to be ſuch. To this purpoſe, and as the laſt argument which I ſhall produce to the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, and his unity with the Father and Son, I ſhall add the declaration of our Saviour himſelf, who declared to the Scribes, who ſaid, "He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils caſteth he out devils;" "all ſins ſhall be forgiven to the ſons of men, and blaſphemies, wherewith ſoever they ſhall blaſpheme: but he that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt hath never forgiveneſs, but is in danger

of

of eternal damnation: becauſe they ſaid, he hath an unclean ſpirit," Mark iii. 22 to 30. Here the context requires the following interpretation, 'Ye have ſaid that I have a devil; it ſhall nevertheleſs be forgiven you: but if ye ſhall hereafter uſe like blaſphemy, ye ſhall never have forgiveneſs: I came not to bear record of myſelf, and therefore diſpenſe with your unbelief; whereas, when the Holy Ghoſt ſhall in due time bear witneſs, that ultimate teſtimony upon which the faith of mankind is to be required; when the whole of that evidence ſhall be afforded to the world, upon which God has thought right to demand the faith of men, and to which he will not add; then, if ye blaſpheme, or lay ſuch a charge againſt the Son of man, declared by the Holy Ghoſt to be God, ye reſiſt the united Trinity, and ſin againſt God, who ſhall bear me witneſs; and whoſe witneſs is greater than that of man, which as yet ye are pardonable for conceiving me only to be.' The manner in which St. Luke has related the ſame event, greatly corroborates this manner of underſtanding the declaration of our Lord, "He that denieth me before men, ſhall be denied before the angels of God. And whoſoever ſhall ſpeak a word againſt the Son of man, it ſhall be forgiven him: but unto him that blaſphemeth againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven;" for our Saviour is in context with the declaration appointing the apoſtles to be witneſſes unto him; and for the purpoſe of rendering them competent and irreſiſtible without ſin, he goes on to ſay, "Take ye no thought how or what thing ye ſhall anſwer, or what ye ſhall ſay: for the Holy Ghoſt ſhall teach you in the ſame hour what ye ought to ſay," Luke xii. 9, 10, 11, 12. On this place it is to be remarked, that our Lord has declared of him who ſhall ſpeak againſt the Son of man, that he ſhall be forgiven; and alſo, that he who denieth him,

him, ſhall be denied alſo. Here are two contradictory aſſertions made, and conſequently two diſtinct circumſtances are to be underſtood for the ſake of reconciling them to truth, and to ſenſe, which eaſily reſults, upon admitting that two diſtinct times are intended; and that "he who now denies me is pardonable; but that he who ſhall hereafter deny me, ſhall himſelf alſo be denied. Ye have not now the manifeſt teſtimony of God; but hereafter the Holy Ghoſt ſhall bear me witneſs: and in the hour when the Holy Ghoſt ſhall teach my appointed witneſſes what they ought to ſay: ye ſhall not be forgiven if ye withhold belief." I deſire my reader will refer this argument to the doctrine of my ſecond chapter.

I have now proved to my own, and I hope alſo to my reader's, entire ſatisfaction, that the Son is God, and that the Holy Ghoſt is God: that the Father is God, and that there is but one God, are conceded points; and, having been admitted, I have been exempted from the neceſſity of proving them. But as there is but one God, and that each of the three perſons is God, does not a Trinity in unity neceſſarily follow? But Mr. Lindſey does not find this concluſion drawn in ſo many words, and ſo will not believe that it reſults. Had Mr. Lindſey told me how many miles it meaſured from Richmond to Catterick, I apprehend he would charge me with great ſtupidity if I could not conclude for myſelf how many miles from Catterick to Richmond; and yet even this obvious inference does not offer itſelf more perſpicuouſly to the underſtanding than that with which he quarrels. The premiſes are all fairly ſtated; and which am I to charge it to, the account of obſtinacy, want of diſcernment, or a compoſition of both, that he will not look upon the neceſſary concluſion, which is, that the object

of

of our religious worſhip is a holy, bleſſed, and glorious Trinity, three perſons and one God?

That each of the three perſons is God, ſeems to me a fully ſufficient reaſon why I ſhould prefer to each my prayer, my praiſe, and my thankſgiving; that the three perſons are one God, is in like manner a reaſon why I ſhould addreſs my adoration to this trinal unity. That this is a ſtumbling-block to the Unitarians and to the Jews, I grant; that to the Greeks it is fooliſhneſs, I grant alſo; that it altogether ſurpaſſes my own faculties, I as freely acknowledge; but that it is revealed by the God of truth I know, and therefore I yield my faith to what he has declared concerning his own inſcrutable nature,

AND WHERE I CAN'T UNRIDDLE LEARN TO TRUST.
PARNELL.

I can clearly ſee that the inſolence of reaſon, or rather of pride under her abuſed name, meets in this point the object of its contempt; but "behold ye deſpiſers, and wonder and periſh; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye ſhall in no-wiſe believe, though a man declare it unto you," Acts xii. 41. I do not apply theſe words uncharitably, I uſe them to ſhew that God had beforehand ordained a difficulty to the conceptions of mankind, that they who withſtand his teſtimony, becauſe they have not been admitted of his council, are impeached of contempt, and threatened with eternal deſtruction. "Knowing therefore the terrour of the Lord," I would perſuade men to humility, to obedience, to faith unto ſalvation, that they may eſcape the "vengeance taken upon them that obey not the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt."

It is not my office to ſtand forth the panegyriſt of the liturgy of the eſtabliſhed church, and therefore I refrain from entering into a ſcriptural vindication of it:

it: if it indeed remain neceſſary now, I have taken a great deal of pains to very little purpoſe; for I ſhould conceive an intelligent reader of the arguments I have already cited in proof of the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt, muſt, without any more particular diſcuſſion of the point, be very well able to vindicate it himſelf, and to ſet forth the propriety of offering up his adoration to them with the Father, one God. Were I diſpoſed ſo to do, I could draw together alſo the opinions of ſome of the wiſeſt men that have ever adorned our iſlands; who have conceived our book of common prayer one of the fineſt compoſitions that has flowed from the pen of man: but even this human compoſition I ſhall not maintain by human authority, though I could bring ſtronger hands to ſupport the fabric of our church, than thoſe of either Dr. Clarke or Mr. Lindſey, which have been deſperately employed in dilapidating; or, to uſe Mr. Lindſey's leſs-confuſed metaphor, in *ſmothering the fabric.*

This gentleman, after he had deprecated all human authority as a ground of faith, we have already ſeen making uſe of it, and nothing elſe, in ſupport of his doctrines. But he has attacked human authority in another ſenſe of the words alſo; and, to the great conſternation of every Briton, who ſhall meet it in his way, has emphatically and concluſively pronounced it A MONSTER. But the terrified reader of his book may calm his breaſt when he comes to know that this ſame monſter is nothing worſe than "a legal eſtabliſhment of the church of England." An eſtabliſhment, the neceſſity of which, I am ſorry to ſay, grows every day more and more obvious; and to whoſe good purpoſes, Mr. Lindſey's own conduct bears an incontrovertible teſtimony. A farther vindication of this alſo exceeds the limits of my deſign; but methinks a gentleman, who has experienced ſuch lenity from our eſtabliſhment,

bliſhment, ſhould at leaſt acknowledge, from the tolerated altar of his new ſynagogue, that the church of England is not a very fierce monſter.

As the limits are, however, of my own appointment, I will take the liberty of tranſgreſſing them a little here. The articles of religion, when firſt preſcribed, were chiefly intended as a barrier to divide our new reformation from Popery, which it had juſt eſcaped, many of the particular tenets of which are formally abjured in them. Though acceſs to the ſcriptures were now permitted to all men, it was thought neceſſary to aſſiſt the weak, in forming their concluſions upon the whole, and to ſum up in brief thoſe doctrines which lie diffuſed in the ſacred writings. Moderation appears alſo to have been a principal object in forming them; for as abhorrence muſt naturally ſucceed the detection of the ſelf-intereſted frauds of the church of Rome, it ſeems a reaſonable apprehenſion, that every tenet which it had held, would fall into contempt, if not conſpicuouſly held forth, as retained by the leaders of reformation; hence the Trinity is formally avowed, in which we continued our agreement. I am far from maintaining that the body of the people ſhould be obliged to ſubſcribe to any articles of faith; but it appears to me abſolutely neceſſary that certain articles of faith ſhould be ſubſcribed by the paſtors in our church, otherwiſe we muſt ceaſe to be a church; and, inſtead of a general amity amongſt men, the goſpel will be converted into a ſource of univerſal diſcord, and bring indeed, not peace, but a ſword; we ſhall, inſtead of a church of England, have as many churches as pariſh miniſters; every pariſh, zealous to maintain the doctrines of its polemic paſtor, will war on its neighbour, and think they do God ſervice by reducing thoſe, who diſſent from them, to opinions which they have been in-

ſtructed to eſteem neceſſary to be entertained. Subſcription to theſe doctrines, as a ſecurity for the maintenance of the impoſed faith, will be required, and that which is now eſtabliſhed in peace, will be, if relinquiſhed, again exacted by the very conſequences of having relinquiſhed it; for, however exceptionable thoſe articles which are now ſubſcribed may be thought, I greatly doubt whether they who complain would agree together in forming a ſet that would be leſs liable to objection; and that ſubſcription would again be required and ſubmitted to, as the purchaſe of tranquillity, I do not entertain the ſmalleſt doubt. Articles, ſumming up in few words the eſſential doctrines diffuſed in the ſcriptures, ought to be preſcribed to thoſe who are authorized to teach; and theſe alone ſhould they be permitted to promulgate, whatever they might privately think. It is true the conſcientious man who does not acquieſce in their truth, and therefore cannot ſubſcribe to them, is excluded from the office of a teacher, and withheld: but from what? from an opportunity of propagating opinions contrary to thoſe which the wiſeſt men have conceived deducible from ſcripture, for by ſuch I conceive theſe articles to be formed. It is to be hoped that many a weak man has a tender conſcience; by this then he is reſtrained from uttering his trifling ſuggeſtions; while he who has leſs ſcrupulouſly acquieſced in what he doubted, has, by his ſubſcription, given ſecurity to mankind that he will not propagate pernicious or ſilly tenets. I do not wiſh to confine the private ſentiments of the heart, but I do to reſtrain the liberty of teaching and imparting ſuch notions as a weak man may inſtill into a credulous or unthinking congregation. Anabaptiſm itſelf pretended to the ſanction of ſcripture, and may again, to the utter ſubverſion of all religion and virtue. The church of Catterick may ſet up againſt that of Northallerton, and

who

who ſhall decide which is right, if there be no preſcript? The more extenſive dioceſan churches may diſagree, and when the church of Carliſle ſhall make inroads into the neighbouring churches of Durham and Cheſter, who ſhall reſtrain the arm that declares itſelf raiſed for the propagation of truth? Inteſtine wars and univerſal confuſion may at length leave the deciſion in the hands of victory, and vanquiſhed truth ſhall then ſubſcribe to articles dictated by its erroneous conquerour. Such would be the proceſs: and let not thoſe who now complain of the neceſſity of ſubſcribing the articles of the church of England, flatter themſelves that matters would be rendered more agreeable even to themſelves, if they ſhould be indulged in their deſires. Perhaps, when every ſpecies of diſturbance and puritanical abſurdity had raged through the nation, and robbed them of their tranquillity, they would then begin to acknowledge the happineſs they enjoyed when protected by that barrier which they had themſelves broken down, and become the firſt to replace it; the want would teach the value of that which they now overlook, becauſe they poſſeſs it. But the ſubſcription of articles of faith is no ſuch mighty grievance as ſome would intimate; it may be a ſeverity to a few who are not admitted into the pulpit, becauſe they cannot accede to them: but ſurely it is a great happineſs to the body of the people that they are under the guardianſhip of an eſtabliſhment that protects them from the neceſſity of liſtening to the whimſical interpretation of weak teachers. It is therefore neceſſary, ſo long as there is no compulſion on the laity to learn and give their faith to the doctrines of the clergy, that the concluſions which are to be drawn from holy writ ſhould be preſcribed to thoſe who are appointed to teach: if they cannot ſubſcribe, let them let it alone, a church with which they cannot concur, is even better without

them. Is it for the admiſſion of a few individuals that a door is to be opened, by which every ſpecies of abuſe may enter?

I honour and concur with Mr. Lindſey's patriot wiſh, that England ſhould ever ſet the example of improvement; but it is very weakly urged, that religion ſhould keep pace with ſcience in improvement, and that a ſubſcription to articles muſt always impede its progreſs; for nothing can be more abſurd than the idea of a progreſſive religion, which, being founded upon the declared, not the imagined will of God, muſt, if it attempt to proceed, relinquiſh that revelation which is its baſis, and ſo ceaſe to be a religion founded upon God's word. God has revealed himſelf, and all that he has ſpoken, and conſequently all that is demanded of us to accede to, is declared in one book, from which nothing is to be retrenched, and to which nothing can be added. All that it contains was as perſpicuous to thoſe who firſt peruſed it, after the rejection of the Papal yoke, as it can be to us now, or as it can be to our poſterity in the fiftieth generation. If we look for any thing new, it is not in the ſcriptures that it is to be found; and if we add, it is not religion that has improved, for truth will never deſert her own foundations, nor follow our fantaſtic imaginations. The progreſs of every ſcience has been to the diſcovery of ſomething new, derived from new combinations of principles within our comprehenſion, and conſequently capable of being compared for the ſake of additional knowledge. Is ſuch a progreſs to be deſired in religon? What novelty do we ſeek for, or what advantage do we propoſe from the introduction of novelty into religion? Such an idea ſeems to intimate

As if religion were intended
For nothing elſe but to be mended. HUDIBRAS.

CHAP.

CHAP. V*.

ΤΩ̃Ν ΠΕΡΙ' ἙΑΥΤΟ̃Υ.

MY name appearing prefixed to this edition will put it out of doubt that I am in truth, as I formerly ſtated myſelf, a Layman, and I conceive that my book has rendered it unneceſſary for me to ſay that I am altogether unread in theological diſputations; of theſe two circumſtances, however, I am now about to make my advantage, for I ſtill deſire to have the end kept in view, and to convert even myſelf into ſome ſort of argument in behalf of it.

On the publication of Mr. Lindſey's Apology, as I have already ſaid, I was drawn by curioſity to look into it; but finding it to contain a doctrine which I had not in the leaſt ſuſpected, (as I really had never known any thing of the gentleman before) I placed the Bible by my ſide, happy in finding the beſt, the only evidence in this caſe offered to the examination of every man. With perfect freedom from prejudice, nay, I am almoſt aſhamed to confeſs it, with the firſt ſerious conſideration of ſo important a point that I had ever entered into †, I ſat down to read Mr. Lindſey's book, and, for the truth of every poſition contained in it, appealed to the word of God himſelf, that I might thence learn how truly it was advanced; when, to my utter aſtoniſhment, I ſoon found that this was the only book upon the ſubject, which the diligent Apologiſt had not critically read, and that in every particular it directly oppoſed itſelf to him, and to his frequent quotations. It grew into a matter

* This chapter is for the moſt part a parody of Mr. Lindſey's concluding chapter, and title is the ſame with his.

† I would not have it underſtood that I had never read the Bible before, but that I never read it to this point, or in a like inquiſitive manner as now,

matter of wonder with me, what could influence a man to ſurrender his worldly competence in defence of a contradiction to the only witneſs that bears any teſtimony concerning the fact which he contradicts. As I had received an education among men not unlettered, I was not altogether unacquainted with the laws of argument, and ſoon perceived his errour to proceed from his having drawn from a wrong ſource, from his having laid aſide the Bible, and ſaid, " my reaſon does not acquieſce in a Trinity of Perſons in the one God, and my reaſon is competent; this is a matter ſubmitted to my faculties, and I am ſkilled to affirm or deny concerning a comprehenſible God." As I found difficulties in lifting up my own faculties to God, I conceived Mr. Lindſey's no better able to ſoar to ſuch unſurmountable heights; and having found that my Maker *had* ſpoken, looked upon his word as the fountain from which all argument concerning him ſhould flow, and accordingly I have ſtated my own idea of the manner of purſuing this enquiry in my firſt chapter. Under this perſuaſion I noted my Bible, and to what purpoſe my reader is empowered to judge from my third and fourth chapters: but, as I went along, the degrees or different ſpecies of teſtimony afforded to the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, offered themſelves to my obſervation; and this alſo I have in my ſecond chapter ſubmitted to public cenſure. Such was the proceſs of an enquiry entered into by a man who ſet about it for his own information only; but the ſubſtance of which, as it has afforded perfect conviction to himſelf, he has at length decided to be due to mankind; at length decided, I ſay, becauſe that many ſcruples delayed my determination. Firſt it occurred to me that, being a Layman, it was, properly ſpeaking, no buſineſs of mine; that an eſtabliſhed clergy was appointed for the defence of religion; that at the head of this Clergy there was a reſpectable and venerable body of learned

learned Biſhops, who were daily acquiring more weight by the acceſſion of a numerous Nobility to their bench; by which acceſſion, if the body ſhould loſe (as in all human probability they will) on the ſide of learning, they were ſure of obtaining conſequence on the ſide of faſhion, and therefore that it was not to be ſuppoſed that the conduct of one country clergyman could long continue of any national importance. But when, on the other hand, I conſidered how ready the world was to impute partiality to any body of men who ſhould write on a ſubject in which their private intereſt was ſo deeply concerned, and that their own ſilence ſhewed they were themſelves aware of this, I thought that a Layman writing upon the ſubject, a man totally unconnected with their profeſſion, would probably be more attended to. Another objection which occurred to me, was my entire ignorance of controverſial theology, and particularly my having never looked into any controverſy upon the Trinity, except what I have ſeen in Mr. Lindſey's book; but being by Mr. Lindſey's book convinced that the Bible was the only guide to be depended upon, I then thought that the reading that with attention would be a ſufficient preparative for writing; that my very ignorance in controverſy would turn to account, and that it might be conſidered as a corroborating proof of the truth of what I ſhould write, that the Bible alone had been found ſufficient to convince *one young man*; and accordingly, thro' the whole courſe of my enquiry, the Bible alone have I conſulted, and this (notwithſtanding that I have acknowledged myſelf educated in theſe doctrines) without a ſingle prejudice, either my own, or borrowed from any other. Perhaps I have been too nicely ſcrupulous in this reſpect; for, through the fear of imbibing one prejudice on ſo important a queſtion, I have worked only on my own ideas derived from ſcripture, ſhunned the ſuperior ſuggeſtions of wiſer men, and diligently withheld myſelf from an acquaintance with any thing

that

that had ever been ſaid upon the ſubject before. I knew not thro' what foul or crooked channels the courſe of the ſtream had been turned, but was very certain that the well-head was pure, and thence only I therefore determined to draw. From this circumſtance I alſo entertained ſome hope, that, being totally unbiaſſed, I might poſſibly ſtrike out ſome new lights; or, where I ſhould accidentally agree with any former writers, put an old argument in ſo different a manner, that it ſhould convey a new impreſſion, and convince ſuch of my readers as affect novelty; for of novelty, if that be a recommendation, they have undoubtedly a chance, as all contained in my work is my own, whether any of it may have been ſtated before or not.

May I have leave to ſay, without blame, that having been born a gentleman, a farther difficulty oppoſed my reſolution to publiſh; the inconſiſtency of ſuch doctrines as I was about to maintain, with the modiſh practices and eaſy principles of the polite world ſuggeſted itſelf to me; why then, it often occurred to me, why muſt I be ſo ſingularly nice and ſcrupulous as not to comply with what men of faſhion accommodate themſelves to? why diſturb others, and not give way to a more chearful way of thinking; why promulgate that veneration for a Deity which a free communication with the world may diſperſe or remove? and why render myſelf obnoxious to men who muſt deteſt the doctrines which reſtrain their will, and not rather wait patiently for a change in the morals of the age? Theſe conſiderations altogether were of weight to divert me for a while from the thought of publication; not that I now juſtify myſelf therein: yea rather I condemn myſelf, and have at length decided to offer to mankind thoſe arguments which have already afforded conviction to myſelf *.

* See Apology, p. 216, of which this paragraph is only a parody.

I am very conſcious that my ſtyle would admit of great improvement; but if it be conſidered that I did not ſee Mr. Lindſey's book till * late in the month of January, I ſhall readily be forgiven by the ingenuous and candid reader, who will ſee that I have employed that time in the purſuit of matter, which, had I leſs regard to an argument of ſo high importance to him and myſelf, I might have beſtowed in poliſhing a leſs convincing work. But why then ſhould I not have withheld it longer from the world, and rendered it better able to ſuſtain their criticiſm? For this ſhort reaſon: a deadly poiſon has been adminiſtered to the publick, I have haſted to prepare the antidote, and have not pauſed to ſugar over the brim of the veſſel in which I offer it to their lips. He muſt love the poiſon who rejects the antidote that is not ſeaſoned to his palate. I am as ſenſible of the charms of language as my faſtidious reader may be, and could perhaps, even without his aſſiſtance, have rendered my own ſtyle more agreeable to his ear, and greatly ſhortened what I have been forced, thro' haſte, to expreſs in unſelected terms. If, however, he be ſuch a man as cannot pardon me, I do not aſk his pardon.

I ſhall here take occaſion to explain what I have written with reſpect to Mr. Lindſey himſelf. I have heretofore conſidered him in the character of a Sectary and Writer only, and conſequently have been under a neceſſity of ſpeaking concerning him in terms, which I have always uttered with regret. I am not, however, going to retract a ſingle ſyllable which can only affect him in his public character; but, on the contrary, more ſummarily to avow the ſubſtance of what I have already laid down. As a Sectary then, I think he would be a dangerous man, had he not himſelf dimi-

 niſhed

* I did not ſee it till the 21ſt of January, and the former edition of this volume was finiſhed from the preſs May 5, 1774.

niſhed his importance by becoming the advocate of his own tenets; for as a Writer, I conſider him to be perfectly harmleſs; yet ſtill from that character, in which I ſhall henceforward addreſs him, I dread the Schiſmatick, and have therefore oppoſed myſelf to a book, which, had it not come from the ſelf-denying hand of this gentleman, might, for me, have gradually ſubſided in its congenial oblivion. His conduct, however, might ſupport it for a time; my effort therefore is more expeditiouſly to diſmiſs it from exiſtence.

It may look a little quarrelſome, that I cannot let even ſo much of his book, as correſponds with the title page, paſs without a cenſure. But this gentleman has thought it neceſſary to make an apology for the moſt unexceptionable conduct that he could poſſibly have purſued; for a ſincere obedience to the dictates of his conſcience; for having made a ſacrifice to what he eſteemed the truth, however miſtaken; for having looked upon pardon as inconſiſtent with the retained offence; and for having convinced mankind that "he had eſcaped the pollutions of the world by his former knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt," 2 Pet. ii. 20. Had he indeed purſued a contrary courſe, and continued to profeſs when he had ceaſed to believe, then would an apology have been truly neceſſary, and we ſhould not perhaps have admitted it to be ſatisfactory, though he had even yielded to the importunity of ſtronger motives than thoſe which he has reſiſted. Had his power of doing good been far more extenſive, and had the ſubſcription of a doctrine, which he did not believe, afforded his benevolent propenſities an opportunity of propagating the oppoſite tenet which he did believe, and think neceſſary to be received by all men, not even ſo good an end ſhould exempt the means from the charge of falſehood, nor the perpetrator from

from the imputation of holding "the damnable doctrine of doing evil that good may come of it." Had a dignified character extended his influence ſtill wider; had the paſtoral office been committed to his hand; and had the emblem of the deſcending ſpirit ſat upon him, he could but ill defend himſelf from the juſtice of univerſal condemnation, though thus, meditating, he ſhould addreſs his mitre, the ſymbol of a cloven tongue, "thou art the ſymbol of a double tongue, and thou ſhalt ſanctify duplicity; thou ſhalt be my warrant for *hypocriſy and prevarication*; for thee will *I keep up all theſe forms* of ſubſcribing what I do not believe, *till relieved by proper authority*, and veſted with dignities without the neceſſity of falſifying, in order to obtain them; for thee *I will miniſterially comply with what I am not able to remove, and patiently remain in my poſt, however invidiouſly miſrepreſented*; for thee, and under thy ſanction, I will utter two languages; I will tell a lye for the ſake of telling truth; enter into terms for the purpoſe of infringing them; and comply with ſuch propoſed conditions as ſhall afford me an occaſion of ſhewing that they ought not to be complied with. At the door of the vineyard I will ſay that *the wild branches* are but the fine luxuriance of nature, and that their growth ought to be encouraged, ſo ſhall I obtain the power of *pruning them away*; I ſhall create to myſelf an opportunity of *rooting out ſome of* what I take to be *the rankeſt weeds*, by telling the owner of the vineyard that I think them the moſt beautiful plants, and engaging that I will diligently cultivate them: thus ſhall I trick him into his own advantage, and prove, by having diſpenſed with truth in order to get admiſſion, that his ſervice, and not my profit, was the only motive to the fraud, the pious fraud by which I induced him to admit me †. Had Mr. Lindſey, I ſay, thus pondering, lulled himſelf

† See conſiderations on the propriety of requiring a ſubſcription to articles of faith.

himſelf into a hope that none *would ſuſpect him of hypocriſy and prevarication*, he ſhould have found it vain; every whiſper would be interpreted into cenſure, and every breeze of opinion, prove a ſtorm ſufficient to diſturb the tranquillity of his ſoul. Is there any man who can have thus dealt by himſelf? To him I call to deſcend from his throne, to ſeek for happineſs in ſelf-approbation, and for public applauſe, by conſpicuous and exemplary virtue; let him place the mitre upon other brows, and put upon his own "the helmet of ſalvation." There are men in England who can profeſs with ſincerity, and maintain what they have profeſſed; who do not need the picklock of equivocation, nor the burglary of more open falſehood, to obtain an entrance into the miniſtry, from which I thus boldly call, in the name of each man's conſcience, upon every perſon, whether he be Archbiſhop, Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, who has ſubſcribed with inſincerity, or who cannot now overcome his ſcruples, to retire, and follow the worthy example which is afforded them by Mr. Lindſey.

As a good man, I honour Mr. Lindſey; as a man ſtrenuous in the maintenance of his faith, though I believe it erroneous, I reſpect him; and if his underſtanding were but nearly commenſurate with his honeſty, I believe that the church which he has deſerted, would have found in him, who is now her weak opponent, an advocate truly able to maintain her cauſe; for I do not remember in my life to have met with a man, in whom the excellencies of head and heart had united, who did not ſubmit his own underſtanding to the word of his Maker, and believe, becauſe that his immutable truth is a fully ſufficient ground of faith.

As I am now about to conclude, I muſt call back the mind of my reader, and having brought my argument

ment to an end, refer to him the iſſue upon which he is to determine.

Either Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God, or he is not; either the Holy Ghoſt is one with the Father and the Son, God, or he is not.—On ſuppoſing that the negative ſide of this dilemma can be aſſumed, (and for argument's ſake it muſt be ſuppoſed, however irkſome) a conſequence enſues, horrible to thought. The God of peace becomes a firebrand of contention; tenfold confuſion proceeds from God, "who is not the author of confuſion;" the Spirit of truth is a lyar; the ſimple and guileleſs zeal of the apoſtles, is crafty and deſigning duplicity; the wiſdom of God, folly, beneath the fooliſhneſs of men; and the revelation of the God of truth, from end to end, ſcarce the word of deſigning falſehood, it muſt have proceeded from a dupe to his own artifices. I ſhudder while I write: but it is acknowledged that the ſcriptures are the word of God, and the application of this deſcription to them I will leave with men who can perſiſt in the denial of this great myſtery: Whereas, on the other hand, three perſons and one God being acknowledged, a fact is eſtabliſhed concerning the things of God, incomprehenſible to us, who have not ſpiritual things to compare with ſpiritual, and which therefore, though it may tranſcend, can never contradict our reaſon. Our belief, which is all that is required, may be yielded to the evidence of the fact without any violence offered to our underſtanding; and therefore, however incomprehenſible the object of the teſtimony may be, there can be no difficulty in making the affirmative, which does not equally attend upon pronouncing the negative of the propoſition, and one of the two we are under an abſolute neceſſity of adopting.

In

In whatſoever God acts, he muſt condeſcend. The whole extent of created nature bears to him but a like proportion as an atom; he is equally the God of a fraction as of the univerſe; and a fraction is as commenſurate to his infinity as the univerſe. But his love is infinite, and we have been the object of it, an object as obſervable by him as all worlds; for, little as we are, we bear the ſame proportion to him. Let us then lay aſide that pride, which, in the pretence of humility, withdraws mankind from the eye of his Maker; from that microſcopick eye, by which even the hairs of our head are numbered; that equal and all-pervading eye, which as accurately ſees and marks the fall of a ſparrow, as the cruſh of worlds. When we thus conſider him, doubts will vaniſh; we ſhall ſee that we may poſſibly be within his contemplation, the objects of his favour; we ſhall acquieſce in a revelation of the benefits he has conferred upon us, and acknowledge that we *have been* the objects of his favour; our ignorance ſhall be diſſipated, our pride depoſed; and reaſon (rightly ſo called) aſſuming her proper dignity, conduct us with certainty ſo far as her own preſcribed boundaries extend; inſtruct us where to pauſe; teach us the limits of our own faculties, and the illimitable extent of our Maker's; put an end to idle ſpeculation; point out God as our revealed Benefactor, not the ſubject of our inquiſitive curioſity; dictate confidence and hope in him; and make us, becauſe he has revealed it, "to acknowledge the myſtery of God, and of the Father, and of Chriſt."

FINIS.

INDEX

TO THE

TEXTS *of* SCRIPTURE *quoted in the third Chapter, according to the Order in which they ſtand compared.*

	Ch.	V.	Page
I.			
Iſaiah —	vii.	14.	50
II.			
Iſaiah —	ix.	6.	50
III.			
Iſaiah —	xliv.	6	50
Revelation —	ii.	8	
IV.			
Iſaiah —	li.	9	51
		10	
		15	
Iſaiah —	lii.	10	
Iſaiah —	liii.	1	
Luke —	iii.	6	
John —	xii.	38	
		41	
1 Corinthians —	x.	9	
V.			
Iſaiah —	xl.	10	52
		11	
Revelation —	xxii.	12	
John —	x.	11	
Hebrews —	xiii.	20	
		21	
VI.			
Iſaiah —	lii.	7	52
Romans —	x.	15	
VII.			
Pſalm —	viii.	2	53
		1	
Matthew —	xxi	16	
VIII.			
Pſalm —	xliv.	22	53
Romans —	viii.	35	
IX.			
Matthew —	vi.	10	54
		13	
Matthew —	xxiv.	30	
		31	
Matthew —	xxv.	31	54
		32	
		33	
		34	
Mark —	viii.	38	
Matthew —	xiii.	41	
Matthew —	xvi.	27	
Luke —	ix.	26	
Epheſians —	v.	5	
2 Timothy —	iv.	1	
2 Peter —	i.	11	
Luke —	xvii.	20 to 30	
X.			
Matthew —	xi.	27	56
Luke —	x.	22	
XI.			
Matthew —	xxviii.	20	57
Mark —	xvi.	20	
Hebrews —	ii.	3	
		4	
XII.			
Mark —	ix.	24	57
XIII.			
Luke —	v.	20 to 25	57
Iſaiah —	xliii.	25	
Nehemiah —	ix.	17	
XIV.			
Luke —	vi.	22	58
		23	
Acts —	vii.	52	
		59	
1 Peter —	iv.	13	
		14	
XV.			
Luke —	viii.	38	59
		39	
Mark —	v.	19	
		20	
John —	xi.	35	

	Ch.	V.	Page
XVI.			
Luke	xxiii.	42	60
		43	
Luke	xxiv.	26	
XVII.			
John	ii.	19	61
		21	
Acts	ii.	32	
XVIII.			
John	iv.	10	61
		14	
Jeremiah	xvii.	13	
Revelation	xxii.	1	
		17	
John	iv.	14	
Isaiah	lv.	1	
Isaiah	xliv.	3	
John	vii.	37	
		38	
Acts	xx.	28	
John	iv.	42	
Isaiah	xii.	3	
XIX.			
John	v.	17	63
		18	
John	v.	26	
		27	
Hebrews	ii.	18	
Hebrews	iv.	15	
John	v.	21	
		25	
		28	
John	vi.	69	
John	ix.	38	
XX.			
John	v.	24	65
John	iii.	18	
John	iii.	13	
John	iii.	31	
John	vi.	62	
John	xvi.	28	
		29	
XXI.			
John	viii.	58	66
Revelation	i.	4	
Exodus	iii.	14	
John	iv.	26	
XXII.			
John	x.	30	67
John	x.	33	
John	x.	38	
XXIII.			
John	xiv.	8	68
		9	
		10	
		11	
XXIV.			
John	xiv.	12	69
		13	
		14	
John	xvi.	23	
Exodus	iii.	15	
1 Timothy	iii.	16	
1 John	i.	1	
John	i.	1	
XXV.			
John	xvi.	7	72
John	xiv.	26	
John	xv.	26	
2 Peter	i.	21	
1 Peter	i.	11	
John	xvi.	14	
		15	
XXVI.			
John	xvii.	1	73
Hebrews	ix.	24	
John	xvii.	5	
		24	
XXVII.			
John	xviii.	37	74
1 Timothy	vi.	13	
John	i.	49	
XXVIII.			
John	xx.	28	75
		29	
John	xx.	16	
XXIX.			
Acts	i.	24	76
John	xv.	27	
Mark	xvi.	15	
Romans	i.	5	
John	ii.	25	
Acts	i.	21	
		22	
Acts	ix.	5	
		6	
		13	
		14	
		15	
1 Corinthians	i.	17	
Luke	xi.	49	
Mattthew	xxiii.	34	
Acts	ix.	20	
		21	

	Ch.	V.	Page
Acts	ix.	2	
		15	
Acts	xxii.	14	76
John	xxi.	17	
John	xiii.	37	
		38	

XXX.

Acts	iii.	12	
Acts	iv.	10	
		21	81
Acts	ix.	34	
		35	

XXXI.

Acts	vii.	54	
		55	
		56	
		57	
		58	
		59	
		60	
John	xvi.	13	
Pſalm	xxxi.	5	
Revelation	xxii.	9	82
Jeremiah	xxiii.	23	
Acts	vii.	56	
		57	
Matthew	xxvi.	64	
		65	
		67	
Matthew	xiv.	61	
		to	
		65	

XXXII.

Acts	ix.	40	88
		42	

XXXIII.

Acts	xi.	18	
		20	
		21	89
		22	
		23	
Acts	xv.	11	

XXXIV.

Acts	xiii.	45	
		46	
		47	
Iſaiah	xlix.	6	
Matthew	xv.	24	89
Acts	xiii.	48	
		49	
Acts	xiv.	1	
		3	

	Ch.	V.	Page
Matthew	xxviii.	20	
Mark	xvi.	20	
Hebrews	ii.	4	89
Acts	xix	10	
		11	

XXXV.

Acts	xvi.	14	
		15	
		16	
		17	
Luke	xxiv.	45	92
Mark	i.	34	
Romans	i.	1	
Philippians	i.	1	
Titus	i.	1	

XXXVI.

Acts	xvi.	30	
		31	
		32	93
		33	
		34	

XXXVII.

Acts	xvii.	18	
Acts	xvii.	23	
		24	
		28	94
Coloſſians	i.	16	
		17	
Iſaiah	xlii.	8	

XXXVIII.

Acts	xviii.	8	
		9	
		10	95
		11	
Acts	xxiii.	11	

XXXIX.

Acts	xviii.	24	
		to	96
		28	

XL.

Acts	xix.	10	
Acts	xix.	17	
		18	97
		19	
		20	

XLI.

Acts	xxi.	11	
		to	97
		14	
Matthew	vi.	10	

XLII.

Acts	xxii.	16	98

	Ch.	V.	Page
XLIII.			
Acts ——	xxii.	17	98
		18	
Acts ——	xxii.	19	
		20	
XLIV.			
Acts ——	xxiv.	5	99
		14	
John ——	v.	39	
XLV.			
Romans ——	i.	1	99
		9	
XLVI.			
Romans ——	ii.	3	100
John — —	v.	22	
Matthew ——	xvi.	27	
Romans ——	ii.	6	
XLVII.			
Romans ——	ii.	4	100
Acts ——	xi.	18	
1 Timothy ——	i.	16	
2 Peter ——	iii.	15	
		9	
XLVIII.			
Romans ——	iii.		101
Romans ——	iv.		
Hebrews ——	xi.		
	xii.		
The whole of each chapter referred to.			
XLIX.			
Romans ——	viii.	9	101
		11	
L.			
Romans ——	ix.	5	102
LI.			
Romans ——	x.	12	102
		13	
LII.			
Romans ——	xiv.	6	103
		to	
		9	
1 Corinthians ——	x.	31	
		28	
LIII.			
Romans ——	xiv.	10	103
		11	
		12	
Isaiah ——	xlv.	23	
		21	
		22	
2 Corinthians —	v.	10	
Hebrews ——	x.	31	

	Ch.	V.	Page
LIV.			
Romans ——	xiv.	14	104
LV.			
Romans ——	xv.	16	105
		19	
LVI.			
Romans ——	xvi.	16	105
1 Corinthians ——	i.	1	
		2	
		3	
		4	
LVII.			
1 Corinthians —	i.	7	106
		8	
1 Corinthians ——	iv.	5	
2 Corinthians ——	x.	14	
		to	
		18	
LVIII.			
1 Corinthians —	i.	11	107
		12	
		13	
1 Corinthians ——	i.	10	
1 Corinthians ——	iii.	5	
		6	
1 Corinthians ——	i.	8	
LIX.			
1 Corinthians —	i.	14	108
		15	
LX.			
1 Corinthians —	i.	26	109
		27	
		28	
		29	
1 Corinthians ——	i.	21	
		31	
2 Corinthians ——	x.	17	
Jeremiah ——	ix.	24	
LXI.			
1 Corinthians	ii.	8	110
Acts ——	iii.	15	
		17	
James ——	ii.	1	
Pſalm ——	xxiv.	10	
Geneſis ——	ii.	7	
LXII.			
1 Corinthians	ii.	7	110
		to the end.	
LXIII.			
1 Corinthians	vii.	25	110.
Daniel ——	ix.	9	

	Ch.	V.	Page
LXIV.			
1 Corinthians	viii.	4	
1 Corinthians —	viii.	6	
Acts ——	xiv.	7	
		15	111
1 Corinthians —	xii.	2	
		3	
1 Corinthians —	xiv.	33	
LXV.			
1 Corinthians	x.	20	
		21	
2 Corinthians —	vi.	15	115
		16	
LXVI.			
2 Corinthians	iv.	5	116
2 Timothy —	i.	8	
LXVII.			
2 Corinthians	xii.	5	
		7	
		8	116
		9	
		10	
LXVIII.			
Galatians —	i.	1	
Galatians ——	i.	11	118
		12	
LXIX.			
Galatians ——	i.	10	
Galatians ——	vi.	12	119
		17	
LXX.			
Galatians ——	iv.	6	
Galatians ——	iii.	8	
Romans ——	viii.	11	119
		14	
		15	
1 Corinthians ——	xii.	3	
LXXI.			
Ephesians ——	i.	7	
Ephesians ——	iii.	8	
		14	
		15	
		16	
Romans ——	ii.	4	
Romans ——	ix.	23	
Ephesians ——	iii.	18	121
		19	
		17	
Ephesians ——	iv.	13	
Ephesians ——	iii.	7	
Ephesians ——	iv.	7	
Romans ——	xi.	33	
		34	

	Ch.	V.	Page
LXXII.			
Ephesians ——	iv.	8	
		9	
		10	122
Ephesians ——	iv.	14	
		15	
LXXIII.			
Ephesians ——	vi.	5	
		6	
		7	123
		8	
Coloſſians ——	iii.	22	
LXXIV.			
Philippians ——	ii.	6	
		7	
		8	124
Coloſſians ——	i.	15	
LXXV.			
Philippians —	iii.	20	
1 Timothy ——	i.	1	
1 Timothy ——	ii.	3	124
1 Timothy ——	iv.	10	
Titus ——	i.	3	
Acts ——	ix.	5	
LXXVI.			
Coloſſians ——	i.	15	
		16	
		17	125
		18	
LXXVII.			
Coloſſians ——	ii.	9	128
LXXVIII.			
Coloſſians ——	iii.	11	
		12	128
		13	
LXXIX.			
Coloſſians ——	iii.	24	
		25	
Romans ——	ii.	5	
		11	128
Epheſians ——	vi.	6	
		9	
James ——	ii.	1	
LXXX.			
1 Theſſalonians	ii.	2	
1 Theſſalonians —	ii.	8	
		9	128
1 Theſſalonians —	iii.	2	
John ——	xvi.	13	
1 Theſſalonians —	ii.	3	
LXXXI.			
1 Theſſalonians	iv.	2	129
		3	

	Ch.	V.	Page
LXXXII.			
2 THESSALONIANS	i.	6	130
		7	
		8	
		9	
		10	
Matthew	vi.	9	
1 Peter	iv.	17	
LXXXIII.			
2 THESSALONIANS	ii.	16	130
		17	
2 Theſſalonians	iii.	3	
LXXXIV.			
2 THESSALONIANS	iii.	5	132
2 Corinthians	ii.	14	
		17	
LXXXV.			
1 TIMOTHY	ii.	5	132
		6	
		7	
		8	
LXXXVI.			
1 TIMOTHY	iii.	16	133
1 Timothy	i.	10	
		11	
LXXXVII.			
1 TIMOTHY	iv.	10	133
1 Timothy	i.	15	
2 Timothy	ii.	8	
		10	
LXXXVIII.			
1 TIMOTHY	vi.	13	134
		14	
		15	
		16	
2 Corinthians	v.	16	
Revelation	xix.	16	
LXXXIX.			
2 TIMOTHY	iv.	1	135
		8	
Titus	ii.	13	
XC.			
TITUS	ii.	13	136
		10	
Revelation	i.	5	
Titus	iii.	4	
		5	
		6	
Titus	i.	3	
		4	

	Ch.	V.	Page
XCI.			
HEBREWS	ii.	16	137
Coloſſians	i.	16	
Hebrews	x.		
Hebrews	vii.		
Hebrews	viii.		
Hebrews	ii.		
XCII.			
JAMES	v.	8	142
		9	
		10	
		11	
James	v.	14	
		15	
Acts	ix.	34	
Luke	viii.	48	
Luke	v.	13	
XCIII.			
JAMES	i.	1	143
James	ii.	1	
		5	
		9	
		13	
XCIV.			
1 PETER	v.	1	144
		2	
		3	
		4	
John	xxi.	14	
		15	
		16	
		17	
John	x.	13	
		14	
1 Peter	ii.	25	
Hebrews	xiii.	20	
Acts	xx.	28	
James	i.	12	
James	ii.	5	
1 Corinthians	ix.	25	
2 Timothy	iv.	8	
1 Peter	iv.	11	
XCV.			
2 PETER	i.	1	146
1 Timothy	i.	1	
XCVI.			
2 PETER	i.	11	146
XCVII.			
2 Peter	iii.	10	146
		11	
		12	
2 Peter	iii.	15	
1 Timothy	i.	16	
2 Peter	iii.	18	

XCVIII.

1 JOHN — ii. 22 148

XCIX.

1 JOHN — iv. 3 148

C.

1 JOHN — v. 7 148

CI.

1 JOHN — v. 13, 14, 15 } 148
1 John — iii. 21, 22 }

CII.

1 JOHN — v. 20
1 John — v. 11, 12, 13 } 149

CIII.

2 JOHN — 9
1 John — ii. 23
1 John — iv. 15, 12 } 151

CIV.

JUDE — 1
Philippians — i. 1
Titus — i. 1
1 Corinthians — i. 1 } 151

CV.

JUDE — 151

CVI.

1 JOHN — iii. 16 153

CVII.

ACTS — xx. 28
Isaiah — xl. 11
Acts — xx. 29, 30 } 153

CVIII.

HEBREWS — i. 8, 10 to 12
Hebrews — i. 9
Romans — ix. 5
Hebrews — xiii 8 } 154

CIX.

REVELATION — ii. 8
Isaiah — xliv. 6
John — xiii. 31, 32
Revelation — i. 8
Revelation — xxii. 13 } 157

Ch. V. Page

CX.

REVELATION — ii. 23
Jeremiah — xvii. 10
Jeremiah — xi. 20
Jeremiah — xx. 12
Isaiah — xliv. 6 } 157

CXI.

REVELATION — i. 8
Matthew — xxiv. 30
Revelation — i. 7
Revelation — iv. 8 } 158

CXII.

REVELATION — i. 18
Revelation — iv. 9, 10, 11
Matthew — vi. 9, 10 } 159
1 Corinthians — viii. 6
Coloſſians — i. 17

CXIII.

REVELATION — iii. 10
Matthew — vi. 13 } 159

CXIV.

REVELATION — iii. 19
Job — v. 17
Hebrews — xii. 6, 7 } 160

CXV.

REVELATION — v. 13
Revelation — i. 4, 5, 6
Jeremiah — xxiii. 23 } 160

CXVI.

REVELATION — vi. 15, 16
Hebrews — i. 12
Revelation — vi. 13, 14 } 162

CXVII.

REVELATION — xiv. 6, 7
Philemon — 9
Romans — i. 16
2 Timothy — i. 8
Philippians — i. 17, 18 } 163
2 Timothy — iv. 1
1 Corinthians — viii. 6
Coloſſians — i. 16, 17

	Ch.	V.	Page
CXVIII.			
Revelation —	xvii.	14	
Revelation ——	xix.	21	
		16	164
		17	
		18	
CXIX.			
Revelation —	xix.	13	
John ——	i.	1	
		14	
		2	
		10	
		11	
Geneſis ——	i.	1	
John —— —	i.	3	
		4	
John — ——	viii.	12	165
1 John ——	i.	5	
		1	
		2	
1 Timothy ——	iii.	16	
1 Peter —— —	i.	23	
Hebrews ——	xi.	3	
Hebrews ——	i.	2	
Revelation ——	iii.	14	
1 Peter — ——	i.	25	
John ——	i.	15	
CXX.			
Revelation —	xx.	6	167
James ——	v.		
CXXI.			
Revelation —	xx.	12	
		13	
		14	
		15	
Matthew ——	xxv.	31	
		32	169
Matthew ——	xvi.	27	
Matthew ——	xiii.	41	
		42	
Revelation —	xxi.	27	
John —— ——	v.	22	
CXXII.			
Revelation	xxii.	13	
Revelation ——	vii.	17	170
Revelation ——	xxi.	6	
		7	
CXXIII.			
Revelation —	xxi.	22	
		23	
Revelation ——	xxii.	5	
		3	171
		4	
Revelation ——	iii.	12	
Revelation ——	xiv.	1	
CXXIV.			
Revelation	xxii.	6	
Revelation ——	i.	1	172
Revelation —	xxii.	16	
CXXV.			
Revelation —	iv.	8	
		11	
Revelation ——	v.	12	
		13	
Revelation ——	vii.	10	
		17	
Coloſſians ——	i.	16	
Iſaiah ——	liii.	7	
Revelation ——	vii.	9	172
		14	
		15	
Revelation ——	xvii.	14	
1 Timothy ——	vi.	15	
		16	
2 Peter ——	iii.	18	
1 Peter ——	iv.	11	
Hebrews ——	xii.	1	
Philippians ——	ii.	10	

INDEX

TO THE

TEXTS *of* SCRIPTURE *quoted in the third Chapter according to the Order in which they ſtand in the Bible.*

	Page
GENESIS i. 1 —	165
——— ii. 7 —	110
EXODUS iii. 14 —	66
——— iii. 15 —	71
NEHEMIAH ix. 17	58
JOB v. 17 —	160
PSALMS viii. 1 —	53
——— viii. 2 —	53
——— xxiv. 10.	110
——— xxxi. 5 —	85
——— xliv. 22	53
ISAIAH vii. 14 —	50
——— ix. 6 —	50
——— xii. 3 —	62
——— xl. 10, 11	52
——— xlii. 8 —	95
——— xliii. 25	58
——— xliv. 3 —	62
——— xliv. 6 —	50, 157, 158
——— xlv. 21, 22, 23	104
——— xlix. 6 —	90
——— li. 9, 10, 15	51
——— lii. 7, 10	51
——— liii. 1 —	51
7 —	173
——— lv. 1 —	62
JEREMIAH ix. 24	61
——— xi. 20	158
——— xvii. 10	158
——— xvii. 13	61
——— xx. 12	158
——— xxiii. 23	86, 161
DANIEL ix. 9 —	111
MATTHEW vi. 9	130, 159
——— vi. 10	54, 98, 159
——— vi. 13	54, 159
——— xi. 27	56
——— xiii. 41	55, 170
——— xiii. 42	170

	Page
MATTHEW xiv. 61 to 65	82
——— xv. 24	91
——— xvi. 27	55, 100, 169
——— xxi. 16	53
——— xxiii. 34	78
——— xxiv. 30	158
31	54
——— xxv. 31, 32, 33, 34	54, 169
——— xxvi. 64, 65, 67	87
——— xxviii. 20,	57, 92
MARK i. 34 —	93
——— v. 19 —	59
——— viii. 38 —	55
——— ix. 24 —	57
——— xvi. 15 —	77
——— xvi. 20 —	57, 92
LUKE iii. 6 ——	51
——— v. 13 ——	143
——— v. 20 to 25 ——	58
——— vi. 22, 23	58
——— viii. 38, 39	59
——— viii. 48 ——	143
——— ix. 26 ——	55
——— x. 22 ——	56
——— xi. 49 ——	78
——— xvii. 20 to 30 —	55
——— xxiii. 42, 43	60
——— xxiv. 26 —	60
——— xxiv. 45 —	92
JOHN i. 1 ——	71

	Page
John i. 1 to 14	165
—— i. 15	166
—— i. 49	74
—— ii. 19 21	61
25	77
—— iii. 13 18 31	65
—— iv. 10 14	61
—— iv. 42	62
—— iv. 26	67
—— v. 17 18 26 27	63
—— v. 21 25 28	64
—— v. 22	100, 170
—— v. 24	65
—— v. 39	99
—— vi. 62	65
—— vi. 69	64
—— vii. 37 38	62
—— viii. 12	165
—— viii. 58	66
—— ix. 38	65
—— x. 11	52
—— x. 13 14	145
—— x. 30	67
—— x. 33	67
—— x. 38	68
—— xi. 35	60
—— 38	52
—— xii. 41	52
12 13 14	69
—— xiii. 31	156
32	156
—— xiv. 8 to 11	68
—— xiv. 12 to 14	68
—— xiv. 26	72
—— xv. 26	72
—— xv. 27	77

	Page
John xvi. 7	72
—— 13	84, 129
—— 14 15	73
—— 23	70
—— 28	66
—— 29	66
—— xvii. 5 24	73
—— xviii. 37	74
—— xx. 16 28 29	75
—— xxi. 14 15 16 17	145
Acts i. 21 22	77
—— 24 25	76
—— ii. 32	61
—— iii. 12	81
—— 15 17	110
—— iv. 10 21	81
—— vii. 51	59
—— 52	58, 59
—— 53	53
—— 54	59, 82
—— 55	59, 82
—— 56	59, 82
—— 57	59, 82
—— 58	59, 82
—— 59	59, 82
—— 60	82
—— ix. 2	79
—— 5	77, 125
—— 6	77
—— 13	78
—— 14	78
—— 15	78
—— 20	78
—— 21	77, 78
—— 22	77
—— 26	78
—— 34	82, 143
—— 35	82
—— 40	88
—— 42	88
—— xi. 18	89, 100
—— 20	89
—— 21	89
—— 22	89

	Page
Acts xi. 23	89
xiii. 45	90
46	90
47	90
48	91
49	91
xiv. 1	91
3	91
7	112
15	112
xv. 11	89
xvi. 14	93
15	93
16	93
17	93
30	93
31	93
32	93
33	93
34	93
xvii. 18	94
23	94
24	95
28	95
xviii. 8	95
9	95
10	95
11	95
24	97
25	97
26	97
27	97
28	97
xix. 10	92, 97
11	92
17	97
18	97
19	97
20	97
xx. 28	62, 145, 154
29	154
30	154
xxi. 11	97
12	97
13	97
14	97
xxii. 14	80
16	98
17	98
18	98
19	98
20	98
xxiv. 5	99
14	99
Romans i. 1	93, 99
5	77
9	100
16	163
ii. 3	100
4	100, 125
5	128
6	100
11	128
iii. 26	101
iv.	101
viii. 9	101
11	101, 120
14	120
15	120
35	53
ix. 5	102, 157
23	121
x. 12	102
13	102
15	53
xi. 33	122
34	122
xiv. 6	103
7	103
8	103
9	103
10	103
11	103
12	103
14	104
xv. 16	105
19	105
xvi. 16	105
1 Corinthians i. 1	105, 151
2	105
3	106
4	106
7	106
8	106, 107
10	107
11	107
12	107
13	107
14	108
15	108
17	78
21	109
26	109
27	109
28	109
29	109
31	109
ii. 7 to the end	110
8	110
iii. 5	107
6	107
iv. 5	106

	Page
1 Corinthians vii. 25	111
——— viii. 4 —	111
6 —	112, 159, 163
——— ix. 25 —	146
——— x. 9 —	52
20 —	115
21 —	115
28 —	103
31 —	103
——— xii. 2 —	115
3 —	115, 120
——— xiv. 33 —	115
2 Corinthians ii. 14	132
17	132
——— iv. 5	116
——— v. 10	104
16	134
——— vi. 15	115
16	115
——— x. 14	107
15	107
16	107
17	107, 109
18	107
——— xii. 5	117
7	117
8	117
9	117
10	117
Galatians i. 1 —	118
10 —	119
11 —	119
12 —	119
——— iii. 8 —	120
——— iv. 6 —	119
——— vi. 12 —	119
17 —	119
Ephesians i. 7 —	121
——— iii. 7 —	122
8 —	121
14 —	121
15 —	121
16 —	121
17 —	122
18 —	121
19 —	121
——— iv. 7 —	122
8 —	122
9 —	122
10 —	122
13 —	122
14 —	123
15 —	123
——— v. 5 —	55
——— vi. 5 —	123

	Page
Ephesians vi. 6 —	123, 128
7 —	123
8 —	123
9 —	128
Philippians i. 1	93, 151
17	163
18	163
——— ii. 6	124
7	124
8	124
10	174
——— iii. 20	124
Colossians i. 15	124, 125
16	95, 125, 138, 163, 173
17	95, 125, 159, 163
18	127
——— ii. 9	128
——— iii. 11	128
12	128
13	128
22	123
24	128
25	128
1 Thessalonians ii. 2	128
3	129
8	129
9	129
——— iii. 2	129
——— iv. 2	129
3	129
2 Thessalonians i. 6	130
7	130
8	130
9	130
10	130
——— ii. 16	130
17	130
——— iii. 3	131
5	132
1 Timothy i. 1	125, 146
10	133
11	133
15	133
16	100, 147
——— ii. 3	125
5	132
6	132
7	132
8	132
——— iii. 16	71, 133, 166
——— iv. 10	125, 133
——— vi. 13	74, 134
14	134
15	134, 174
16	134, 174

	Page
2 Timothy i. 8	116, 163
—— ii. 8	134
10	134
—— iv. 1	55, 135, 163
8	136, 146
Titus i. 1 —	93, 151
3 —	125, 137
4 —	137
—— ii. 10 —	136
13 —	136
—— iii. 4 —	136
5 —	136
6 —	136
Philemon 9 —	163
Hebrews i. 2	166
8	155
9	155
10	155
11	155
12	155, 162
—— ii.	139
The whole referred to.	
3	57
4	57, 92
16	137
17	140
18	63, 149
—— iv. 15	63
—— vii.	140
The whole referred to.	
—— viii.	140
The whole referred to.	
—— ix. 24	73
—— x.	139
The whole referred to.	
1	140
5	140
6	140
20	139
31	104
—— xi.	101
The whole referred to.	
3	166
—— xii.	101
The whole referred to.	
1	174
6	160
7	160
—— xiii. 8	157
20	52, 145
21	52
James i. 1 —	143
12 —	145
—— ii. 1 —	110, 128, 144
5 —	144, 146
9 —	144

	Page
James ii. 13 —	144
—— v.	168
The whole referred to.	
8 —	142
9 —	142
10 —	142
11 —	142
14 —	143
15 —	143
1 Peter i. 11	73
23	166
25	166
—— ii. 25	145
—— iv. 11	146, 174
13	59
14	59
17	131
—— v. 1	144
2	144
3	144
4	144
2 Peter i. 1	146
11	55, 146
21	72
—— iii. 9	101
10	146
11	147
12	147
15	100, 147
18	147, 174
1 John i. 1 —	71, 165
2 —	165
5 —	165
—— ii. 22 —	147
23 —	151
—— iii. 16 —	153
21 —	149
22 —	149
—— iv. 3 —	148
12 —	151
15 —	151
—— v. 7 —	148
11 —	149
12 —	149
13 —	149
14 —	149
15 —	149
20 —	149
2 John 9 —	151
Jude, the whole,	151
Revelation i. 1	172
4	66, 160
5	136, 160
6	157, 160
7	158
8	157, 158

		Page
Revelation i.	18	159
——— ii.	8	51, 157
	23	157
——— iii.	10	159
	12	172
	14	166
	19	160
——— iv.	8	159, 173
	9	159
	10	159
	11	159, 173
——— v.	12	173
	13	161, 173
——— vi.	13	163
	14	163
	15	162
	16	162
——— vii.	9	174
	10	173
	14	174
	15	174
	17	170, 173
——— xiv.	1	172
	6	163
	7	163
——— xvii.	14	164, 174

		Page
Revelation xix.	13	165
	16	134, 164
	17	164
	18	164
	21	164
——— xx.	6	167
	12	169
	13	169
	14	169
	15	169
——— xxi.	6	171
	7	171
	22	171
	23	171
	27	169
——— xxii.	1	62
	3	171
	4	171
	5	171
	6	172
	9	85
	12	52
	13	157, 170
	16	172
	17	62

ERRATA.

Page.	*line.*	*for.*	*read.*
19	17	the inſcrutable	his inſcrutable
33	23	the Lord ſhall	the Lord God ſhall
101	32	ſynonimous.	*dele* the full point
160	31	ϗ̃	ϗ̃
164	12	the Lord	*dele* the

There are, beſides, a few typographical errours of leſs importance, which are therefore left unnoticed. The reader is requeſted to pardon theſe, and the omiſſion or miſplacing (if any there be) of the inverted commas, by which quotations are marked.

PAGE 40—Pliny's Epiſtle to Trajan, giving him an account of the profeſſours of Chriſtianity, is alluded to; in which he ſays of them, "Carmenque Chriſto quaſi "Deo dicere ſecum invicem."

PAGE 195—The horrid perſecution carried on in Africa, againſt the Believers in the Godhead of our Saviour, by the Arian tyrant HUNERIC, in the fifth century, is alluded to—See Moſheim's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Vol. I. p. 401, Octavo, 1768.

PAGE 198—In ſupport of what I have ſaid concerning Mr. Hume, ſee his works *paſſim*. Or rather ſave yourſelf the diſagreeable labour, and attentively read Dr. Beattie's manly and convincing *Eſſay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, in oppoſition to Sophiſtry and Scepticiſm*; in which you will find Mr. Hume already detected. — See alſo Harris's well-authenticated *Hiſtorical and Critical Account of Charles* I. p. 264, Octavo, 1758, where the Infidelity of the Hiſtorian is pointed out.